

1 **LOUISIANA COASTAL PROTECTION AND RESTORATION**
2 **TECHNICAL REPORT**

7 *DRAFT*

12 **RISK-INFORMED DECISION FRAMEWORK**
13 **APPENDIX**

25 February 2008
26



29 **U. S. Army Corps of Engineers**
30 **New Orleans District**
 Mississippi Valley Division

TABLE OF CONTENTS

31	GLOSSARY	iii
32	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
33	1. INTRODUCTION	1
34	1.1 Purpose of this Document	1
35	1.2 Overview of the Risk-Informed Decision Framework	2
36	1.2.1 RIDF is based on the USACE’s Planning Process, Outfitted to Incorporate Risk Analysis and Decision Analysis.....	2
37	1.2.2 Why is RIDF “Risk-Informed?”	3
38	1.2.3 What are the Advantages of RIDF?	3
39	1.3 Scope of this Appendix	4
40	2. BACKGROUND	4
41	2.1 Planning in the USACE – The Six-Step Planning Process.....	4
42	2.2 Changes in the Planning Landscape	5
43	2.3 USACE’s Efforts to Address Planning Needs	5
44	2.4 How is RIDF an Incremental Improvement in Addressing Planning Needs?	7
45	2.5 Adaptive Management.....	9
46	3 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RIDF	10
47	3.1 Step 1: Specify the Problem and Opportunities	12
48	3.1.1 Problem Statement.....	12
49	3.1.2 Planning Objectives	15
50	3.1.3 Outcome Metrics of Performance.....	18
51	3.2 Step 2: Inventory and Forecast to Establish Baseline Conditions	24
52	3.3 Step 3: Formulation of Alternative Plans.....	26
53	3.3.1 Plan Formulation.....	26
54	3.4 Step 4: Evaluate Effects of Alternative Plans	27
55	3.5 Step 5: Compare Alternative Plans	28
56	3.5.1 Stakeholder Preferences.....	28
57	3.5.2 Multi-attribute Utility and MCDA.....	29
58	3.5.3 Risk-Informed Decision Making	31
59	3.6 Step 6 Recommend a Plan	32
60	4 APPLICATION OF RIDF TO LACPR PROJECT SELECTION	33
61	4.1 Stakeholder Workshops Activities Summary	33
62	4.2 Stakeholder Weightings	35
63	4.2.1 Analysis of Stakeholder Weights (Agency Stakeholders in Baton Rouge Workshop).....	37
64	4.2.2 Analysis of Stakeholder Weights (All Weight Elicitation Sessions).....	40
65	4.3 Plan Rankings by MAU Score	45
66	4.3.1 Ranking of Coastal Alternatives	45
67	4.3.2 Ranking of Structural and Nonstructural Alternatives.....	46
68	4.3.3 Summary of Results for Planning Unit 1	53
69	4.3.3.1 Identification of Preferred Alternatives – Planning Unit 1	63
70	4.3.3.2 Expected Utility – Planning Unit 1	64
71	4.3.3.3 Sensitivity of Decisions to Assumptions about the Probability of Higher Levels of Relative Sea Level Rise – Planning Unit 1	68

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

77	4.3.4	Ranking of Structural and Nonstructural Plans - Planning Unit 2	69
78	4.3.4.1	<i>Identification of Preferred Alternatives – Planning Unit 2</i>	84
79	4.3.4.2	<i>Expected Utility – Planning Unit 2</i>	85
80	4.3.4.3	<i>Sensitivity of Decisions to Assumptions about the Probability of Higher Levels of Relative Sea Level Rise – Planning Unit 2</i>	89
82	4.3.5	Ranking of Structural and Nonstructural Plans - Planning Unit 3a	90
83	4.3.5.1	<i>Identification of Preferred Alternatives – Planning Unit 3a</i>	101
84	4.3.5.2	<i>Expected Utility – Planning Unit 3a</i>	102
85	4.3.5.3	<i>Sensitivity of Decisions to Assumptions about the Probability of Higher Levels of Relative Sea Level Rise – Planning Unit 3a</i>	106
87	4.3.6	Ranking of Structural and Nonstructural Plans - Planning Unit 3b	107
88	4.3.6.1	<i>Identification of Preferred Alternatives – Planning Unit 3b</i>	119
89	4.3.6.2	<i>Expected Utility – Planning Unit 3b</i>	120
90	4.3.6.3	<i>Sensitivity of Decisions to Assumptions about the Probability of Higher Levels of Relative Sea Level Rise – Planning Unit 3b</i>	124
92	4.3.7	Ranking of Structural and Nonstructural Plans - Planning Unit 4	125
93	4.3.7.1	<i>Identification of Preferred Alternatives – Planning Unit 4</i>	137
94	4.3.7.2	<i>Expected Utility – Planning Unit 4</i>	138
95	4.3.7.3	<i>Sensitivity of Decisions to Assumptions about the Probability of Higher Levels of Relative Sea Level Rise – Planning Unit 4</i>	141
97	5.	DISCUSSION	142
98	6.	PATH FORWARD	146
99	7.	CITATIONS	149

ATTACHMENTS

104	Attachment 1 – Stakeholder Workshop Participants
105	Attachment 2 – Stakeholder Allocations (Agency Data Baton Rouge)
106	Attachment 3 – Stakeholder Allocations (All Data Combined)
107	Attachment 4 – Consumer Reports Analysis of Results – Planning Unit 1
108	Attachment 5 – Consumer Reports Analysis of Results – Planning Unit 2
109	Attachment 6 – Consumer Reports Analysis of Results – Planning Unit 3a
110	Attachment 7 – Consumer Reports Analysis of Results – Planning Unit 3b
111	Attachment 8 – Consumer Reports Analysis of Results – Planning Unit 4

115 **GLOSSARY**

116

117 **Eustatic:** Changes in relative sea level rise that are caused by global forces such as climate
118 change.

119 **Isostatic:** Changes in relative sea level rise that are caused by local forces such as land
120 subsidence and glacial rebound.

121 **Measure:** A component of plans for risk reduction. Categories of risk reduction measures
122 include structural, nonstructural and coastal restoration.

123 **Metric:** A parameter for quantifying the performance of plans in respect to planning objectives.

124 **Natural variability:** The heterogeneity of some attribute in a population.

125 **Plan:** Any detailed scheme, program, or method worked out beforehand to accomplish an
126 objective. A plan incorporates a combination of structural, nonstructural, and coastal restoration
127 measures for risk reduction. Plans emerge from the plan formulation process.

128 **Residual risk:** The portion of risk remaining after the recommended plan has been implemented.

129 **Uncertainty:** A lack of knowledge that originates from an incomplete understanding of the
130 structure and function of natural or manmade systems, the choice of a model to represent those
131 systems, and the choice of the input values for the parameters of the chosen model.

132 **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

133
134 This appendix outlines a Risk-Informed Decision Framework (RIDF) for the Louisiana Coastal
135 Protection and Restoration (LACPR) effort. The RIDF provides a robust and comprehensive
136 approach to plan selection and draws from current practice in the fields of multi-criteria decision
137 analysis (MCDA) and risk/uncertainty analysis. The RIDF is solidly grounded in and follows
138 closely the USACE’s six-step planning process, but augments this planning process by
139 incorporating specific techniques and methods from risk analysis and MCDA. There are
140 numerous advantages to this approach.

141

142 The RIDF enhances the level of communication and collaboration among decision-makers and
143 stakeholders by providing structured opportunities for interaction. The RIDF uses the
144 information gained through this process to define a set of decision objectives, outcome metrics,
145 and preference weights that reflect stakeholder priorities and provide an analytically sound,
146 defensible, and quantitative approach to decision making. In this way, decision outcomes can
147 more adequately satisfy the interests, values, and objectives germane to the decision. The RIDF
148 also incorporates information about uncertainty into the decision process and facilitates
149 discussion of residual risks, which are the expected damages from storms that will remain after a
150 plan is implemented. Accurate forecasts about the future are difficult, and decisions that ignore
151 these uncertainties may differ from and perform less well than those that do not. Therefore, the
152 RIDF explicitly considers uncertainty originating from two sources: relative sea level rise and the
153 future pattern of development. Information about these uncertainties manifests itself in the
154 outcome metrics and in the scoring and ranking of alternative plans.

155

156 The optimality of a prospective decision outcome depends upon values and beliefs that can vary
157 across different stakeholder groups. Since the LACPR decision process involves a broad
158 spectrum of stakeholders, the RIDF evaluates the sensitivity of the recommendations to these
159 values and beliefs to help decision-makers and stakeholders understand the robustness of
160 recommendations and anticipated outcomes. In this way, the RIDF helps to identify what further
161 studies may be needed and what communication and negotiation efforts could be improved.
162 These efforts also build confidence in the planning process and commitment to the selected plans.

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

163 We also recognize the role that adaptive management can play in connection with the RIDF as a
164 mechanism for monitoring and maintaining the performance of decisions over longer planning
165 horizons.

166
167

168 1. INTRODUCTION

169 1.1 ***Purpose of this Document***

170
171 This appendix develops the risk-informed decision framework (RIDF). The RIDF has been
172 developed to integrate risk and decision science methods into the US Army Corps of Engineers
173 (USACE) planning process while emphasizing consistency with existing USACE planning
174 guidance.

175

176 The LACPR decision process must consider a comprehensive set of planning objectives that
177 include: 1) the reduction of risks to human life, property, and the regional economy; 2) the risks
178 reduction of the region's cultural heritage, natural resources, and environmental quality; and 3)
179 the construction, operations, and maintenance costs associated with any particular alternative. In
180 addition to these numerous diverse interests that must be addressed through the planning process,
181 the Louisiana coastal area is a dynamic environment that is rapidly changing in ways that are
182 difficult to predict. Prudent decision makers will therefore take account of the uncertainty
183 regarding economic, environmental, and other conditions that may affect the outcome of a project
184 during the planning horizon.

185

186 The LACPR decision problem is to recommend a comprehensive plan that will reduce the risks of
187 flooding caused by storm surge and coastline degradation while considering a full range of risks
188 to people, cultural heritage, environment, property, and economy as well as infrastructure
189 construction, operations, and maintenance costs. The RIDF is responsive to these and other
190 decision support needs of LACPR for which conventional decision support methods are poorly
191 suited. The RIDF offers a decision approach that accounts for a comprehensive set of coastal
192 assets in Louisiana and acknowledges the presence of a diverse group of stakeholders who exhibit
193 conflicting interests and objectives. The RIDF approach also addresses uncertainty in certain
194 environmental, social, and economic trends over the planning horizon that can affect the
195 desirability of risk reduction strategies.

196

197 Conventional approaches to decision making have emphasized cost-benefit analysis, which is
198 suitable only when decision outcomes can be fully monetized. There is now an increasing level

199 of consideration given to assets that are difficult to quantify in monetary terms, such as wildlife
200 habitat and cultural diversity, which tend to confound the application of that approach.
201 Conventional decision methods have also emphasized a single decision objective built around
202 national economic development objectives. However, the LACPR planning guidance requires an
203 accounting of regional economic development, environmental, and other social effects objectives
204 as well. Therefore, a multi-attribute decision analysis method is needed. In addition to the
205 presence of multiple objectives, there is diverse set of stakeholders whose interests must also be
206 taken into account. Conventional approaches to decision making have also tended to ignore
207 uncertainty. By evaluating and communicating uncertainty during the planning process, the
208 RIDF helps lead decision makers to more well-reasoned and rational choices. The RIDF attempts
209 to address the shortcomings of conventional decision approaches in a manner that is consistent
210 with the USACE planning guidelines.

211

212 **1.2 Overview of the Risk-Informed Decision Framework**

213 **1.2.1 RIDF is based on the USACE’s Planning Process, Outfitted to 214 Incorporate Risk Analysis and Decision Analysis**

215
216 The Risk-Informed Decision Framework (RIDF) is consistent with the USACE’s standard
217 approach to planning, but augments that approach with insights and techniques drawn from the
218 fields of decision and risk analysis. The RIDF provides procedures to help decision makers
219 identify planning objectives, performance metrics, and stakeholder priorities.

220

221 RIDF draws on multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) techniques (specifically, multi-attribute
222 utility theory (MAUT)), because plan selection involves multiple, competing objectives
223 denominated in in-commensurate terms, i.e., when some attributes of an objective such as life-
224 cycle infrastructure costs can be expressed in monetary terms and others, such as environmental
225 quality, cannot.

226

227 The RIDF draws on risk analysis (RA) techniques to characterize and assess the uncertainties that
228 complicate the LACPR decision. These include uncertainties in the economic and environmental
229 conditions that will influence the outcome of a decision (such as the rate of relative sea level rise)

230 as well as the stochastic nature of storm surge events. The objective is to help planners
231 characterize the critical uncertainties most important to the choice among plans and to identify
232 robust risk reduction strategies, which are decision alternatives that perform relatively well across
233 a wide range of future conditions.

234

235 **1.2.2 Why is RIDF “Risk-Informed?”**

236

237 The RIDF is risk-informed because it:

- 238 • accounts for the consequences of low-probability storms including expected property
239 damages, population at risk, and regional economic impacts.
240 • helps decision makers adjust their decisions to account for a lack of knowledge regarding
241 the economic and environmental conditions that will influence plan performance.

242

243 **1.2.3 What are the Advantages of RIDF?**

244

245 The RIDF has several advantages.

- 246 • The framework engages stakeholders and decision makers in a process of issue
247 identification and priority setting to formally establish project goals. The process helps
248 decision makers to:
249 ○ Identify and reveal hidden agendas
250 ○ Identify, acknowledge and, when possible, fill data gaps that, if filled, could
251 influence decisions;
252 • Objectives are expressed in the form of a multi-attribute utility function that:
253 ○ Gives objectives that are difficult to monetize the same consideration as monetary
254 objectives, enabling environmental and social decision objectives to receive equal
255 consideration with economic objectives.
256 ○ Allows decision makers to make explicit tradeoffs between objectives because
257 progress on one objective can be used to compensate for lack of progress on
258 another objective.

259

260 **1.3 Scope of this Appendix**

261
262 This appendix provides an overview of the six planning steps in terms of the LACPR risk-
263 informed decision framework. Additional detail is provided on Step 3, formulation of plans, in
264 the main report and in the Structural Plan Component Appendix, Nonstructural Plan Component
265 Appendix, and Coastal Plan Component Appendix. Contents of this Appendix include:

- 266 • Introduction, background and scope
- 267 • Methods used to implement MCDA and the RIDF
- 268 • Detailed descriptions of metrics and scenarios
- 269 • Results of rankings and uncertainty
- 270 • Conclusions and recommendations
- 271 • Attachments of tables and figures showing outputs

272
273 **2. BACKGROUND**

274 **2.1 Planning in the USACE – The Six-Step Planning Process**

275
276 The *Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land*
277 *Resources Implementation Studies* (also known as Principles and Guidelines or P&G) and
278 Engineering Regulation (ER) 1105-2-100, *Guidance for Conducting Civil Works Planning*
279 *Studies* sets out a six-step planning process:

- 280 1. Specify problems and opportunities;
- 281 2. Inventory, forecast and analyze conditions relevant to the identified problems and
282 opportunities;
- 283 3. Formulate alternative plans;
- 284 4. Evaluate the effects of the alternative plans;
- 285 5. Compare alternative plans;
- 286 6. Recommend a plan from the compared alternatives.

287
288
289 Since publication of the P&G in 1983, USACE planning and decision-making have been based,
290 primarily, on a comparison of alternatives using economic factors. Planners have also been

291 confronted with the challenge to provide for integrated systems that serve multiple objectives
292 (e.g., a coastal system that provides for flood and storm damage reduction, navigation, and
293 ecosystem restoration).

294

295 **2.2 Changes in the Planning Landscape**

296

297 In response to a USACE request for a review of P&G planning procedures, the National Research
298 Council (1999) provided recommendations for streamlining planning processes, revising P&G
299 guidelines, analyzing cost-sharing requirements and estimating the effects of risk and uncertainty
300 integration in the planning process. Implementation guidance of the Environmental Operating
301 Principles (EOP) (<http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cepa/envprinciples.htm>) within USACE civil
302 works planning directs that projects adhere to a concept of environmental sustainability that is
303 defined as “a synergistic process whereby environmental and economic considerations are
304 effectively balanced through the life of project planning, design, construction, operation and
305 maintenance to improve the quality of life for present and future generations” (USACE 2003a, p.
306 5). While adhering to the overall P&G methodology, USACE (2003b) advises project delivery
307 teams to formulate acceptable, combined economic development/ecosystem restoration
308 alternatives through use of multi-criteria/trade-off methods.

309

310 **2.3 USACE’s Efforts to Address Planning Needs**


311

312 Over the last several years, the USACE has been developing approaches and guidance for
313 implementing multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) approaches for planning (Yoe, 2002;
314 Linkov et al. 2004; Kiker et. al. 2005). This approach utilizes a comprehensive decision analytic
315 framework that considers a broad array of objectives and criteria/metrics, including those
316 associated with ecosystem restoration (Males, 2002). Guidance contained in *Trade-Off Analysis*
317 *Planning and Procedures Guidebook* (2002) lays out a multi-criterion decision analytic approach
318 for comparing and deciding between alternative plans and relates the P&G six-step planning
319 process described above to outputs of the RIDF, as depicted in Figure 1.

320

Over the last several years, the USACE has been developing approaches and guidance for implementing multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) approaches for planning (Yoe, 2002; Linkov et al. 2004; Kiker et. al. 2005). The challenge has been to select and implement an analytical approach that best serves the USACE's needs and provides outputs that can be incorporated into existing decision-making processes, which are laid out in the USACE's *Trade-Off Analysis Planning and Procedures Guidebook* (2002). In addition to serving the needs of USACE planning, the decision framework should provide structure and tools for interacting and communicating with partners, stakeholders, and the public about planning and risk. The approach utilizes a comprehensive decision analytic framework that considers a broad array of objectives and criteria/metrics, including those associated with ecosystem restoration (Males, 2002). Figure 1 relates the P&G six-step planning process described above to outputs of the RIDF, as depicted in Figure 1.

333



334

335 Figure 1: The 6 steps of the P&G and resultant outputs of the risk-informed decision framework.

336

337

338 **2.4 How is RIDF an Incremental Improvement in Addressing
339 Planning Needs?**


340
341 Making effective and credible flood and storm damage reduction planning decisions requires an
342 explicit structure for jointly considering the positive/negative impacts and risks, along with
343 associated uncertainties, relevant to the selection of alternative plans. The complexity of flood
344 and storm damage reduction and coastal landscape stabilization in South Louisiana requires
345 integration of multiple models and tools as well as expert judgment. Integrating this
346 heterogeneous and uncertain information demands a systematic and understandable framework to
347 organize complex and often limited technical information and expert judgment.

348
349 Having the right combination of **people** is the first essential element in the decision process
350 (Figure 2). The activity and involvement levels of three basic groups of people (decision makers,
351 scientists and engineers, and stakeholders) are symbolized in Figure 2 by dark lines for direct
352 involvement and dotted lines for less direct involvement. While the actual membership and
353 function of these three groups may overlap or vary, the roles of each are essential in maximizing
354 the utility of human input into the decision process. Each group has its own way of viewing the
355 world, its own method of envisioning solutions, and its own societal responsibility. Policy- and
356 decision-makers spend most of their effort defining the restoration planning context and the
357 overall constraints on the decision. In addition, they may have responsibility for final plan
358 selection and implementation. Stakeholders may provide input in defining the problem, but they
359 contribute the most input in helping formulate performance metrics and making value judgments
360 for weighting the various metrics. Depending on the problem and restoration context,
361 stakeholders may have some responsibility in ranking and selecting the final option. Scientists
362 and engineers have the most focused role in that they provide the measurements for metrics that
363 quantify the degree to which the various alternatives satisfy the objectives of the project; while
364 they may take a secondary role as stakeholders or decision-makers, their primary role is to
365 provide the technical input necessary to inform the decision process.


366

367



People:



Process:



Tools:



368

369

370 Figure 2: Proposed decision process (adapted from Linkov et al. 2004 and Kiker et al. 2005). Dark
 371 lines indicate direct involvement / applicability and dotted lines indicate less direct involvement /
 372 applicability.

373

374 The ***process*** depicted in Figure 2 is composed of two major elements: (i) generating alternative
 375 restoration scenarios, performance metrics, and value judgments and (ii) ranking the alternatives by
 376 applying value weights. The process generates and defines choices, performance levels, and
 377 preferences. The process also methodically screens non-feasible alternatives by first applying
 378 screening mechanisms (*e.g.*, excessive cost, performance below minimal levels or unacceptable
 379 social consequences) and then evaluating, in detail, the remaining alternative restoration plans
 380 through the use of decision criteria/metrics that are parameterized with data from engineering
 381 models, experimental data, or expert judgment and then ranking those plans through use of MCDA
 382 techniques. MCDA separates judgments about scaling the relative performance of alternatives
 383 using a metric from judgments about weighting those metrics (Clemen, 1995). We discuss scaling
 384 and weighting in subsequent sections. While it is reasonable to expect that the process may vary in

385 specific details for different planning projects (i.e., based on project needs), the planning
386 accomplished through use of this framework operates within an overall adaptive management
387 structure whereby learning, accomplished through additional study and monitoring, is being used to
388 ensure that the process is responsive to changes in decision priorities or new knowledge that can
389 affect alternative selection or implementation strategies.

390

391 The **tools** used within group decision making and scientific research are essential elements of the
392 overall decision process. The applicability of the tools is symbolized in Figure 2 by solid lines
393 (direct involvement) and dotted lines (indirect involvement). Decision analysis tools help to
394 generate and map technical data as well as individual judgments into organized structures that can
395 be linked with other technical tools from risk analysis, modeling, monitoring, and cost estimations
396 (see Section 2.1). Decision analysis tools can also provide useful graphical techniques and
397 visualization methods to express the gathered information in understandable formats. When
398 changes occur in the requirements or the decision process, decision analysis tools can respond
399 efficiently to the new inputs. Flood and storm damage reduction planning requires the use of
400 multiple mechanistic, empirical, and stochastic models, and combinations thereof, for examining
401 flood and storm inundation stage-frequencies to assess the performance of alternatives under several
402 uncertain future conditions. Output from these models has been combined to calculate specific risk
403 factors affecting coastal Louisiana. Finally, decision models incorporate individual risk model
404 predictions and reconcile conflicting priorities expressed by different stakeholder groups through
405 transparent and reproducible valuation protocols. The decision analysis tools are used to compare
406 the alternative plans and conduct sensitivity analysis to assess the robustness in relative
407 performance across future scenarios of the resulting rankings.

408

409 The entire process results in a comprehensive, structured process for selecting the optimal
410 alternative in any given situation, drawing from stakeholder preferences and value judgments as
411 well as scientific modeling and risk analysis.

412

413 **2.5 Adaptive Management**

414

415 The consequences of Hurricane Katrina have motivated the USACE to examine both its processes
416 and institutional culture. The USACE must be responsive and reliable, and change will be required
417 to ensure that USACE remains so. Actions for Change were identified that will serve as catalysts
418 for that change (see [http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cepa/releases/News_Release_-_
419 USACE_12_Actions_for_Change.pdf](http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cepa/releases/News_Release_-_USACE_12_Actions_for_Change.pdf)). Key to the successful implementation of these actions is
420 use of integrative and comprehensive systems-based approaches, adaptive planning, stakeholder
421 involvement and risk communication.

422

423 A comprehensive systems approach which also employs adaptive planning and engineering (so
424 named in the Actions for Change) pursues collaborative engagement with stakeholders, while
425 seeking to design, construct, maintain and update engineered systems to be more robust with respect
426 to future conditions. This adaptive management approach is also similarly implemented within the
427 Working Group for Post-Hurricane Planning for the Louisiana Coast (Working Group 2006) and the
428 Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) investigations (USACE 2004). We emphasize the role the RIDF can
429 play within an overall adaptive management structure within the LACPR as a mechanism for
430 addressing uncertainties within planning and, ultimately, the performance of the selected measures.
431 In this sense, adaptive management transcends the planning process and encompasses the full life-
432 cycle of LACPR, from planning through construction and operations and maintenance. See the
433 main report for more information on the adaptive management plan being developed for LACPR.

434

435 3 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RIDF

436

437 The Risk-Informed Decision Framework (RIDF) assists decision makers by condensing the decision
438 problem into a transparent and tractable format. The RIDF can be described in terms that are
439 closely aligned with the standard USACE approach to planning. It utilizes techniques from the
440 fields of risk and decision analysis to accommodate multiple objectives, conflicting stakeholder
441 values, both qualitative and quantitative assessments of performance, and uncertainty in the natural,
442 social, and economic environment in which decisions will be played out.

443

444 As implemented for LACPR, the RIDF procedure can be summarized as follows. Decision makers
445 and stakeholders establish an objectives hierarchy to fully and uniquely characterize the important
446 outcomes of each decision alternative. A set of outcome measures of performance is then chosen to
447 represent the performance of each alternative in terms of achieving each of the decision objectives.
448 The outcomes of the alternative plans are modeled and, to the extent there are uncertainties present
449 that may significantly affect performance outcomes, this evaluation of plans is replicated over a set
450 of scenarios that represent a range of possible conditions during the performance phase. Once all of
451 these evaluations are complete, a multi-attribute utility function is developed to assess the overall
452 utility of each plan given its performance in terms of achieving the objectives.

453

454 The relationship between the six steps of the USACE planning process and RIDF is illustrated in
455 Figure 1. RIDF activities are closely related to the six step USACE planning process as follows:

456

- 457 1. Specify Problems & Opportunities: Frame the decision by developing a problem statement
458 and identifying the spatial and temporal boundaries of analysis. Establish planning
459 objectives and choose outcome measures of performance, or metrics, which reflect progress
460 toward achieving the planning objectives.
- 461 2. Inventory and Forecast Conditions: Select models of physical and economic systems or
462 other appropriate tools to simulate decision outcomes in terms of the selected performance
463 metrics. Identify important sources of uncertainty in physical and economic models.
- 464 3. Formulate Alternative Plans: Formulate decision alternatives by identifying potential
465 measures for flood risk reduction, pre-screening infeasible measures, and formulating coast-
466 wide plans from remaining measures.
- 467 4. Evaluate Effects of Alternative Plans: Model the outcome measures of performance for each
468 alternative and each scenario.
- 469 5. Compare Alternative Plans: Obtain weights on objectives from the decision maker and/or
470 stakeholder groups. Calculate multi-attribute utility and implement the decision analysis for
471 each alternative, each scenario, and each stakeholder group. Screen out plans that are
472 consistently dominated.
- 473 6. Select a Recommended Plan: Develop recommendations based on the analysis.

474

475 **3.1 Step 1: Specify the Problem and Opportunities**

476

477 Framing the problem to be solved is one of the most difficult and critical tasks in the planning
478 process because it forces planners to clarify their objectives. Framing also helps to identify what
479 attributes should be considered in judging decision outcomes and what metrics should be used in
480 assessing progress toward objectives. Framing helps to establish what spatial and temporal scales
481 are needed for modeling decision outcomes. For example, the preferred alternative may change
482 with the spatial resolution chosen for an analysis; therefore, factoring such spatial variation into
483 how the framework is used along the coast should be considered. Similarly, the most preferred
484 decision may vary as a function of the timeframe under consideration: a longer planning timeframe
485 may lead to a preference for alternatives with higher fixed costs and lower operational/maintenance
486 costs.

487

488 **3.1.1 Problem Statement**

489

490 The people, economy, and environment of coastal Louisiana are vulnerable to flooding caused by
491 the storm surge associated with major hurricanes. This high vulnerability is caused by a uniformly
492 low-lying landscape and severe disruption of a once natural process of sediment deposition and
493 marsh-building associated with the lowermost Mississippi River.

494

495 Louisiana's coastal plain has suffered system-scale instability and deterioration from the early
496 1900s to the present. Effects in the region stem from a combination of natural and human-induced
497 activities that extend into the entire Mississippi River Basin. Drastic landscape changes that have
498 already occurred and are predicted to take place this century place in jeopardy coastal populations,
499 assets, and ecosystems that must exist to continue producing benefits regionally and nationally.

500 Catastrophic impacts of the 2005 Atlantic Tropical Cyclone season in the Gulf of Mexico revealed
501 the need for investment in flood and storm damage risk reduction and coastal ecosystem restoration.

502

503 LACPR coordinated its planning effort with parallel efforts in other agencies and maintained a
504 continuous exchange of ideas and information with those agencies throughout the planning process.

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

505 The LACPR plan is being coordinated via extensive public involvement through a series of
506 workshops, public scoping meetings, and stakeholder forums. In addition, the USACE is
507 coordinating with other water resources plans and projects including navigation, flood control, and
508 ecosystem restoration projects. These other planning efforts and programs involve State and other
509 programs, including the 100-year Hurricane Storm Damage and Risk Reduction System in the New
510 Orleans metropolitan area, Interagency Performance Evaluation Team Task Force (IPET) Study,
511 State of Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA) Master Plan, and
512 Louisiana Recovery Authority (LRA) Community Recovery and Redevelopment Planning, among
513 many others.

514

515 An extensive public scoping process was conducted by the State of Louisiana and the USACE in
516 spring 2006 to (1) explain flood and storm inundation-stage frequency threats, regional
517 vulnerabilities, and potential consequences, and (2) solicit stakeholder views on
518 problems/needs/opportunities, stakeholder values, and measures that stakeholders believe would
519 reduce risks. More than 600 comments were distinguished (comments found in the draft Master
520 Plan “*Integrated Ecosystem Restoration and Hurricane Protection - Louisiana’s Comprehensive*
521 *Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast*” dated February 2007 at <http://www.lacpra.org/>). Common
522 themes were identified by first categorizing comments into themes and then assigning each
523 comment to one or more themes. Perhaps not surprisingly, among the most common themes was
524 that input based on local experience, knowledge and ideas was critical to a successful planning
525 effort. There was also broad recognition of the need for an integrated, innovative, multidisciplinary
526 solution. Included within that integrated view was the acknowledgment that a mix of structural and
527 nonstructural measures was required. Any plan that leans too much toward structural or
528 nonstructural measures is not likely to meet with local and regional acceptance.

529

530 Among the more frequent, distinct comments at public meetings held in spring 2006 were several
531 topics that suggested problems, objectives, and metrics. These were:

- 532 • Marsh, wetland, and barrier island restoration, preservation, and conservation are integral to
533 coastal risk reduction.
- 534 • Coastal risk reduction measures must address salinity change.
- 535 • Coastal risk reduction measures must address subsidence.

- 536 • Coastal risk reduction must address sediment delivery.
- 537 • Innovative/creative technology, international consultation, and local knowledge were all
538 encouraged.
- 539 • Regional economic vitality should be a focal point.

540

541 A comprehensive atlas of potential structural, nonstructural, and ecological measures was compiled
542 after the scoping and stakeholder input process (LACPR Plan Formulation Atlas, dated 16 April
543 2007). This atlas of measures provided the foundation for alternative plan formulation and is
544 available at <http://www.lacpr.usace.army.mil/>.

545

546 Another way of capturing the public interests is to organize comments within the P&G system of
547 accounts in which effects are categorized with respect to National Economic Development (NED),
548 Regional Economic Development (RED), Environmental Quality (EQ), and Other Social Effects
549 (OSE). This system of accounts is considered in more detail in Section 3.1.3. Considered in this
550 way, few stakeholder comments tied directly to NED while several related to RED. This trend is to
551 be expected from a series of regional meetings. Several comments related to EQ, most commonly
552 in relation to the restoration of marshes, wetlands, and barrier islands in order to augment structural
553 solutions for flood and storm damage reduction. For the most part, the appeal for coastal landscape
554 stabilization seemed driven more by flood and storm damage reduction than broader ecological
555 concerns, but the latter concern was also evident. In a related manner, appeals were common for
556 greater commitment to freshwater diversions (to build marsh by delivering river water with its high
557 sediment load). Control of salinity intrusion was also prominent. Comments involving OSE related
558 to better evacuation plans and methods, reducing risk to historic sites, and risk reduction of South
559 Louisiana communities and culture intimately tied to the marshes and the fish and wildlife they
560 support.

561

562 Engagement with LACPR stakeholders has continued and has provided further input on problems,
563 solutions, and values.

565 The following problem statement was drafted with the above issues in mind: The people, economy,
566 environment, and culture of South Louisiana, as well as the Nation, are at risk from severe and
567 catastrophic hurricane storm events as manifested by:

568

- 569 • Increasing risk to people and property from catastrophic hurricane storm events.
570 • Increasing vulnerability of coastal communities to inundation from hurricane induced
571 storm damages due to coastal subsidence, wetland losses, and relative sea level rise.
572 • National and regional economic losses from hurricane flooding to residential, public,
573 industrial, and commercial infrastructure / assets.
574 • Losses to high levels of productivity and resilience of South Louisiana coastal ecosystem
575 due to natural conditions and coastal storm disturbances.
576 • Risks to historic properties and traditional cultures and their ties and relationships to the
577 natural environment due to catastrophic hurricane storm events.

578

579 The risks associated with the problem can rarely be eliminated or entirely prevented. Thus, residual
580 risks that will remain after plan implementation must be considered. The nature of the risks to the
581 planning area is identified in the problem statement.

582 **3.1.2 Planning Objectives**

583

584 The purpose of this section is to delineate the objectives appropriate to a sound solution to the
585 LACPR decision problem that can be readily articulated to an array of audiences.

586

587 As a group, a good set of planning objectives must be collectively exhaustive. That is, nothing that
588 really matters can be left out. However, and again with an eye to simplification, the list must be
589 limited to only the ones that really do matter. Each objective should be specific and succinct
590 (Keeney and Raffia 1976). An objective must be unambiguous yet still succinctly stated, as brevity
591 helps communication and clarifies thinking. Progress toward each objective must be measurable
592 using one or a few metrics so that predictions can be quantified and performance can be assessed.
593 Objectives must also be realistically achievable and relevant. Finally, there must be concordance
594 with practical time frames (Hobbs and Meier 2000). In other words, predictions must be possible

595 within the planning time frame or monitoring of performance must be possible within a useful time
596 frame.

597

598 The objectives, decision attributes, and measures of performance used in this analysis were
599 developed by the LACPR Technical Team. The planning objectives for LACPR are:

600

- 601 • Reduce risk to public health and safety from catastrophic storm inundation;
- 602 • Reduce damages from catastrophic storm inundation;
- 603 • Promote a sustainable coastal ecosystem;
- 604 • Restore and sustain diverse fish and wildlife habitats, and;
- 605 • Sustain the unique heritage of coastal Louisiana by protecting historic sites and supporting
606 traditional cultures.

607

608 The objectives identified in the preceding paragraph were organized within the RIDF framework
609 using the USACE P&G System of Accounts (Yoe and Orth 1996), which guides an evaluation of
610 the effects of a project with respect to National Economic Development (NED), Regional Economic
611 Development (RED), Environmental Quality (EQ), and Other Social Effects (OSE). Establishing
612 the system of accounts 1) shows all effects important to decision-making, 2) explicitly shows the
613 NED effects as the basis for establishing the economic feasibility of the plan, 3) offers a rational,
614 organized framework for presenting the results of the LACPR analysis, and 4) provides a means for
615 comparing plan effects. The plans' effects presented in the system of accounts relate to the plans'
616 contributions toward planning objectives. The effects of the plans are arranged such that the
617 differences among the plans are easily discerned.

618

619 In recent history, USACE planners have been guided to select the NED plan (the one maximizing
620 national economic development benefits) as the preferred alternative, while still meeting National
621 Environmental Policy Act requirements. The New Orleans District has received slightly different
622 and more flexible guidance for the critical LACPR effort. Namely, choice is not constrained to an
623 NED plan but rather more broadly to a cost-effective plan that best meets objectives across the

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

624 NED, RED, EQ, and OSE accounts. Metrics proposed in the subsequent section for evaluating
625 project effects in LACPR are categorized according to these four accounts.

626 **3.1.3 Outcome Metrics of Performance**

627

628 Metrics to be used to guide the LACPR evaluation are presented in Table 1. These metrics were
629 used to score and then rank flood and storm damage reduction measures and plans. In selecting this
630 set of metrics, we strove to represent the best available information for evaluating alternatives in the
631 LACPR, keeping in mind the characteristics of effective metrics (see Roy, 1985; Seager et al. 2007,
632 Graedel and Allenby 2002, Seager and Theis 2004; Yoe 2002). Metrics for LACPR were selected
633 as being:

634

- 635 **Verifiable.** Two independent assessments yield similar results.
- 636 **Cost-effective.** The technology required to generate data for the metrics is economically
637 feasible and does not require an intensive deployment of labor.
- 638 **Easy to communicate to a wide audience.** The public understands the scale and context of
639 the metric and can interpret the metric with little additional explanation.
- 640 **Changeable by human intervention.** The metric has a causal relationship between the
641 state of the system and the variables that are under the decision-maker’s control. Metrics
642 that are independent of human action do not inform a management, policy-making, or design
643 process.
- 644 **Credible.** Stakeholders perceive that the metric accurately measures that which it is
645 intended to measure.
- 646 **Appropriate scale.** The metric is applicable at the spatial and temporal scales chosen for
647 analysis.
- 648 **Directed.** Metric scales whether they are qualitative or quantitative, are bi-directional polar
649 scales.
- 650 **Relevant.** The metric reflects stakeholder priorities and enhances the ability of managers
651 and regulators to faithfully execute their stewardship responsibilities. There is no point
652 assembling a metric no one cares about.
- 653 **Sensitive** enough to capture the minimum meaningful level of change or make the smallest
654 distinctions that are still significant, and it would have uncertainty bounds that are easy to
655 communicate.

- 656 o **Minimally redundant** in that what it measures is not essentially reflected by another metric
657 in the set being used.
658 o **Transparent** such that use of the metric avoids “readily unapparent and/or known agendas.”

659

660 It is important to acknowledge here that there will be “conflicts” among plan results as measured by
661 these metrics, resulting in the need to make tradeoffs. For example, a tradeoff may exist between
662 achieving any significant benefit from a project and minimizing cost. The tradeoff concept is
663 discussed in Step 5. As a consequence of such “conflicts,” a given measure or alternative may not
664 take clear precedence over other measures or alternatives in respect to every metric for evaluating
665 performance. This may present a dilemma to decision-makers, who are trying to choose a single
666 measure or plan. It is important to place development of metrics prior to the formulating plans
667 because the “hard thinking” that goes into developing the metrics can create an improved set of
668 measures from which to formulate plans; this in turn permits stakeholders to focus on thinking
669 about the objectives rather than anchoring themselves to favored measures (Keeney and Raiffa
670 1976).

671

672 Within a particular scenario, uncertainty is clarified by delineating the magnitude of uncertainty
673 surrounding metric value estimates. Metric estimates depend upon a mathematical model, empirical
674 data from a study, or expert opinion. All of these sources share varying degrees of knowledge
675 uncertainty, presumably more so for expert opinion than for models and studies. Along with
676 indicating the basic source of metric estimates, it is necessary to explicitly state the important
677 underlying assumptions and indicate which are highly uncertain, moderately uncertain, or highly
678 certain. Beyond these fundamental elements, estimates of uncertainty for metric values should be
679 quantified (e.g., in terms of the variance or range associated with the estimate). Such quantification
680 of the level of uncertainty surrounding metric estimation must be captured and integrated in the
681 decision analysis to make risk-informed decisions.

682

683 Tables 1-3 list the metrics used in LACPR. For complete descriptions of all metrics used in this
684 effort, please see Section 6 in the Main Report.

685

686 For simple systems, metrics may be easy to enumerate and interpret and inexpensive to
687 parameterize. However, in cases such as LACPR, which involve both complex human and natural
688 system drivers, development of measurable performance standards poses significant challenges.
689 Both natural and human systems involved in restoration planning are complicated and relate to one
690 another in a myriad of ways. Consequently, any set of metrics is incomplete and may at best be
691 considered only representative of the decision factors that could be brought to bear on the situation.
692 For this reason, metrics are often referred to as indicators to emphasize the representational
693 relationship these measures have to the state of complex systems. They are indicative – but not
694 definitive – gauges, and consequently must be interpreted with their limitations in mind.
695

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

696
697

Table 1. LACPR Objectives and National Economic Development Metrics.

Planning Account	Planning Objective	Metrics	Units	Description	Data Source
National Economic Development	Reduce damages from catastrophic storm inundation	Residual Damages	\$	Residual damages are a measure of the dollar damages to assets in the planning area expressed in annual terms. The equivalent annual damage value includes damages to residential and non-residential properties, emergency losses, losses to agricultural resources, and damages to the transportation infrastructure.	USACE feasibility studies, HAZUS-MH, LDOL, NASS, Calthorpe Associates, and Moody's Economy.com
		Life-cycle Cost	\$	Life-cycle costs represent the total cost of an alternative and include the sum of construction, operations/maintenance, real estate, and mitigation costs.	USACE engineering
		Construction Time	Year	The year in which protection is completed will be assessed to gauge the value of rapidly completing protection.	USACE engineering

698

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

699

Table 2. LACPR Objectives and Environmental Quality Metrics.

Planning Account	Planning Objective	Metrics	Units	Description	Data Source
Environmental Quality	Promote a sustainable coastal ecosystem	Spatial Integrity (area, edge, shape, connectivity and interspersion)	Unitless (scaled 0-1)	The size, shape, density, configuration and structure of patches across a landscape affect fundamental ecosystem processes, which determine the trajectories of ecological condition. Spatial integrity refers to undivided, contiguous space.	Models, empirical data, maps, and expert opinion
		Wetlands Created and/or Protected	Acre	The direct measure of gain of wetlands created and those existing wetlands protected from further degradation.	Models, empirical data and expert opinion
	Restore and sustain diverse fish and wildlife habitats	Direct Wetland Impacts	Acres	Many of the proposed levee alignments cross wetlands and result in the direct loss of those wetlands occupied by the footprint of the levee and adjacent borrow areas. The magnitude of the impact is a function of the levee alignment and the level of risk reduction, which influences levee base width.	Models, empirical data and expert opinion
	Reduce impacts	Indirect Impacts	Unitless	This metric compares levee alignments and their potential indirect impacts (both positive and negative) to wetlands and other aquatic resources. Indirect impacts considered include hydrologic changes, effects on fisheries, potential to induce development in wetlands, and consistency with coastal restoration. Rankings range from +8 to -8, with a positive ranking meaning that there is the potential for beneficial effects to wetlands.	Expert opinion and pertinent scientific literature.
	Sustain the unique heritage of coastal Louisiana by protecting cultural resources	Archaeological Sites Protected	Number of sites	The number of archaeological sites protected. Archaeological sites may include the remains of buildings, trash pits, hearths, pottery, and tools (stone, metal, and other materials).	Surveys and registers
		Historic Properties Protected	Number of properties	The number of historic properties include properties eligible or listed on the National Register and National Historic Landmarks	Surveys and registers

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

700 Table 3. LACPR Objectives and Regional Economic Development and Other Social Effects Metrics.

Planning Account	Planning Objective	Metrics	Units	Description	Data sources
Regional Economic Development	Reduce damages from catastrophic storm inundation	Gross Regional Output Impacted	\$	This metric assesses the effects of protection and/or wetland restoration alternatives on the planning unit's economic output.	NAICS IPET LDOL Calthorpe Associates
		Employment Impacted	Number of people employed	This metric assesses the effects of alternatives upon employment.	LDOL Calthorpe Associates
		People's Earned Income Impacted	\$	This metric assesses the effects of alternatives on individual income.	LDOL
Other Social Effects	Protect public health and safety from catastrophic storm inundation	Residual Population Impacted	Number of people	The impacted population is defined as the total number of residents in a planning unit that would experience flooding from a given alternative.	U.S. Census Calthorpe Associates
	Sustain the unique heritage of coastal Louisiana by protecting cultural resources and supporting traditional and ethnic communities	Historic Districts Protected	Number of Historic Districts & Uniqueness	The number of Historic Districts protected. Historic Districts encompass living communities – not inanimate cultural records - consisting of clusters of historic buildings and structures that share a similar date or theme.	Surveys and registers

701

702

703

704 **3.2 Step 2: Inventory and Forecast to Establish Baseline Conditions**

705

706 In this step of the planning process, models and tools are selected to simulate decision outcomes
707 in terms of the selected performance metrics. Each of the alternative plans will perform more or
708 less well depending, in part, on social, economic, and environmental conditions during the
709 planning horizon. However, these conditions are beyond the control of decision makers and there
710 is much uncertainty about these conditions. Uncertainty is a lack of knowledge that originates
711 from an incomplete understanding of the structure and function of natural or manmade systems
712 (e.g., coastal hydraulics at the mouth of the Mississippi).¹ Uncertainty is often classified as
713 either model uncertainty or parameter uncertainty. Model uncertainty is a lack of knowledge
714 about the proper structure of a model (e.g., choice of a two vs. a three dimensional model to
715 simulate hydrodynamics). Parameter uncertainty is the lack of knowledge about the best value to
716 use as an input parameter value for the chosen model.

717

718 Decision analytic techniques enable decision makers to make rational decisions despite
719 uncertainty. Rational decisions can be made accounting for only the most important sources of
720 uncertainty, which are those that account for the largest source of error in predictions of decision
721 outcomes. Decision analysis works best when the uncertainty in input values can be fully
722 characterized. However, if it is not possible to do so, or planners are simply unwilling to fully
723 characterize the uncertainties in input variables, decision support can also be achieved by
724 analyzing the robustness of the optimal plan over the scenarios that represent the possible social,
725 economic, and/or environmental conditions under which plan performance might be realized.
726 The LACPR Technical Team selected three uncertain input variables from hydrologic and
727 economic models and simulated performance outcomes for four scenarios. These variables are
728 relative sea level rise, the employment growth rate, and regional land-use policy.

¹ Although the mathematics used to describe variability and uncertainty is essentially similar, uncertainty is widely recognized as being distinct from natural variability. Variability describes the heterogeneity in an inherently random value. For example, the heterogeneity of some size attribute within a population. This variability is, in principle, not reducible (Morgan and Henrion 1990). In contrast, uncertainty can be thought of as a lack of knowledge about what parameter value to use in a model or how to represent a process in a mechanistic model. This lack of knowledge might in principle be reduced, although reducing some uncertainties can often be difficult in practice.

729

730 Relative Sea Level Rise

731 Hydrologic models are used to simulate property damage from storm surge and associated
732 impacts on the regional economy. The uncertain input considered in hydrologic models is the
733 relative rate of relative sea level rise (RSLR). Relative sea level rise is the net effect of eustatic
734 and isostatic changes in relative sea level rise. The exact rates of relative sea level rise used in
735 modeling plan performance vary by planning unit to reflect differences in observed rates along
736 the Louisiana coast. In general RSLR may take one of two values: it may be “lower” or “higher.”
737 In Planning Units 1 and 4, “lower” means that sea levels are 1.3 feet above the sea level projected
738 for 2060 given historical trends in sea level. “Higher” means that sea level is 2.6 feet above the
739 level that is projected for 2060 given historical trends in sea level. In Planning Units 2, 3a and
740 3b, “lower” and “higher” sea levels are 1.9 and 3.2 feet above sea level, respectively.

741

742 Employment Growth Rate

743 Economic models are used to simulate development over the planning horizon. The variable
744 selected for uncertainty analysis is the employment growth rate. These patterns differ in terms of
745 the rates of employment growth. Employment growth may be described as “high” or “business as
746 usual”. The high employment future development scenario assumes that the State of Louisiana
747 will implement policies that will be conducive to employment growth in non-traditional industries
748 such as technology. The business as usual future development scenario assumes that the State of
749 Louisiana will continue the policies that were in place before Hurricane Katrina, and that growth
750 will primarily occur in the traditional Louisiana growth industries such as oil and gas, medical
751 research, and tourism.

752

753 Land Use Allocation Policy

754 LACPR considered three land-use allocation policies, one leading to dispersed development, one
755 leading to compact development, and one leading to a hybrid development state. Each scenario
756 describes the location and type of development expected to take place throughout southern
757 Louisiana. The location of future development was primarily based on the existing and projected
758 transportation system in each area. However, other factors, including current and projected
759 commercial activity, land elevation, susceptibility to flooding, and other hazards were also
760 considered. The compact land allocation assumes that redevelopment will primarily take place

761 within the five metropolitan statistical areas in coastal Louisiana, with the construction of more
 762 multi-family housing units relative to single family dwellings. The dispersed land use allocation
 763 assumes that redevelopment will be spread out from the major cities and that there will be more
 764 single family residential construction relative to multi-family dwellings.

765

766 LACPR’s original intent was to use these three variables to develop twenty-seven scenarios for
 767 simulating the performance of each plan and assess the sensitivity of performance metrics to these
 768 planning assumptions. The number of scenarios was reduced to four by collapsing the
 769 employment growth rate and the land-use allocation policy into a single variable and dropping the
 770 hybrid land-use policy because the scenarios produced limited variation in the modeled
 771 performance outcomes. The four scenarios selected by the LACPR Technical Team for use in
 772 risk-informed decision making are shown in Table 4.

773

774 Table 4: Four scenarios developed for LACPR.

		Relative Sea Level Rise	
		(Lower)	(Higher)
Pattern of Development	High employment / compact population	$k = 1$	$k = 2$
	BAU employment / dispersed population	$k = 3$	$k = 4$

775

776 Scenarios provide an overall structure for considering future with and without project conditions.
 777 In addition, planning requires development of performance objectives (as specified by the P&G).

778 **3.3 Step 3: Formulation of Alternative Plans**

779 **3.3.1 Plan Formulation**

780

781 Plan formulation is the process of building plans that meet planning objectives and avoid
 782 planning constraints. It requires the knowledge, experience, and judgments from many
 783 professional disciplines, as well as the views of stakeholders, other agencies and non-
 784 governmental organizations (NGOs), and the public. Plan formulation capitalizes on imagination
 785 and creativity wherever it is found, across technical backgrounds and group affiliations.

786 Formulating plans includes developing management measures (e.g., structural and nonstructural),
787 identifying planning units, conducting screening of measures, and combining measures into
788 alternative plans. Plans include abilities to be modified into the future within the adaptive
789 management framework. For more details on the formulation of plans and planning units for
790 LACPR, refer to the main report and the Structural Plan Component Appendix, Nonstructural
791 Plan Component Appendix, and Coastal Plan Component Appendix.

792

793 **3.4 Step 4: Evaluate Effects of Alternative Plans**

794

795 Once the plans have been formulated, the performance of each plan with respect to each metric is
796 estimated for each decision alternative and scenario. The LACPR Technical Team accomplished
797 this step using mechanistic or empirical models of physical, economic, and social systems where
798 available and expert judgment where such models were not available. Sources of metric data are
799 presented in Tables 1-3. Descriptions of the models used to generate metric data are presented in
800 the Hydromodeling Appendix, Economics Appendix, Coastal Restoration Plan Component
801 Appendix, etc.

802

803 **3.5 Step 5: Compare Alternative Plans**

804

805 In this step, the objective is to rank the decision alternatives (plans) using an abstract utility
806 measure that integrates information about anticipated performance outcomes and stakeholder
807 interests. The MCDA approach used for LACPR is multi-attribute utility theory (MAUT)
808 (Keeney and Raiffa 1976). With respect to its applications in MCDA, the advantage of MAUT is
809 that it converts a multi-objective decision with competing objectives into a single objective
810 problem for which the objective is to maximize utility given information about the decision
811 maker's preferences. The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the approach. Sub-
812 section 3.5.1 describes how information on stakeholder preferences is brought into the decision
813 making process. Sub-section 3.5.2 describes the calculation of a multi-attribute utility score, the
814 ranking of decision alternatives, and decision analysis. Sub-section 3.5.3 describes how
815 sensitivity and uncertainty analysis can be used in conjunction with MCDA specifically to
816 support risk-informed decision making. Specific details about this application of RIDF are
817 provided in Section 4.0.

818

819 **3.5.1 Stakeholder Preferences**

820

821 The first step toward developing a multi-attribute utility function is to collect information on
822 stakeholder preferences by finding out how much importance stakeholders place on the various
823 decision objectives. Information about stakeholder preferences is obtained through workshops
824 during which stakeholders participate in a series of assessments designed to obtain information on
825 their preferences. These preferences are expressed as relative weights on decision objectives.
826 These weights are subsequently incorporated into a multi-attribute utility function that is then
827 used to calculate the utility score by which decision alternatives are ranked. This process gives
828 stakeholders an active role in the decision making process because, if stakeholder weights are
829 used in the utility function, the ranking of plans is then tied directly to their preferences.

830

831 Since stakeholders can exhibit a diverse set of preference patterns, it is important to consider how
832 this diversity of preference will be treated in the decision analysis. If there are many
833 stakeholders, their sheer number may make it very difficult to consider each one's preferences

834 individually. In addition, there would be much redundancy in such an approach because most
835 stakeholders appear to have some recognizable preference patterns. On the other hand,
836 aggregating stakeholders into a single group and averaging their weights to represent an
837 amalgamated public interest is also not a good strategy, particularly if diverse values have been
838 expressed in the stakeholder population. An averaged set of weights would tend to converge on
839 an equal distribution of weights across the decision objectives and/or a set of weights that is not
840 likely to represent anybody's interests in particular.

841

842 The approach used in this analysis is to analyze the sets of weights obtained from individual
843 stakeholders and then classify them based on their expressions of common preference patterns.
844 For classification purposes, we rely on a set of multi-variate statistical techniques known as
845 cluster analysis to identify distinct preference patterns that exist within the stakeholder
846 population. Once stakeholders have been segregated based on their preferences, the patterns of
847 preference that are characteristic of each group can be represented by averaging their weights on
848 decision objectives. At this time, no particular consideration is given to the prevalence of each
849 preference pattern in the LACPR planning area. The primary concern is to understand what
850 patterns of preference exist in the planning area and what affect these different patterns of
851 preference might have on the choice of a risk-reduction plan.

852

853 **3.5.2 Multi-attribute Utility and MCDA**

854

855 The multi-attribute utility function transforms the metrics for the several objectives to a single,
856 aggregate measure of utility. The utility function is compensatory in the sense that it allows
857 progress on one objective to substitute for lack of progress on another objective. The rate of
858 compensation depends upon the relative weight on each objective, which depends upon the
859 preferences of the decision maker. Multi-attribute utility (U) is the weighted sum of L outcome
860 measures of performance, $V(m_{jkl})$: $U_{jk} = \sum_l w_l V(m_{jkl})$. Outcome measures of performance are
861 evaluated through modeling studies for $j = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, J\}$ decision alternatives and $k = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, K\}$
862 planning scenarios. Planning scenarios represent the range of possible futures under which plan
863 performance may be realized. A set of weights (w) that reflects the relative importance of each
864 decision objective is elicited from the decision maker and/or stakeholders using a direct weighting

865 procedure (see Section 3.5.1). Weights may take any value between zero and one, but must sum
 866 exactly to one. Value scores are then calculated from a linear utility function for each
 867 metric, $V(m_{jkl})$, that is either increasing or decreasing with that metric, m_{jkl} . For an economic

868 “good” (*i.e.*, more is better): $V(m_{jkl}) = \frac{m_{jkl} - \underset{jk}{\text{MIN}}(m_{jkl})}{\underset{jk}{\text{MAX}}(m_{jkl}) - \underset{jk}{\text{MIN}}(m_{jkl})}$ and for an economic “bad”:

$$V(m_{jkl}) = 1 - \frac{m_{jkl} - \underset{jk}{\text{MIN}}(m_{jkl})}{\underset{jk}{\text{MAX}}(m_{jkl}) - \underset{jk}{\text{MIN}}(m_{jkl})},$$

869 where the *MIN* and *MAX* functions are over all decision
 870 alternatives and scenarios. Each scenario is represented by a set of possible values for uncertain
 871 variables in hydrologic and economic models used to simulate outcome measures of performance.
 872 Value and utility scores, which are bounded by 0 and 1 so that scores closer to 0 indicate less
 873 desirable outcomes, are calculated for the outcome of each alternative and scenario, including a
 874 “No Action” alternative.

875
 876 In MCDA without uncertainty, the objective is to maximize the multi-attribute utility function for
 877 a set of stakeholder preferences by choosing the “best” decision alternative. Results of the
 878 analysis can also be presented more comprehensively by ranking the alternatives by their utility
 879 score. This analysis is useful because much can be learned about the alternatives themselves by
 880 observing how the utility score varies from one alternative to another. For example, it is possible
 881 that some alternatives may yield as much utility as the preferred alternative, but do so because
 882 they accentuate performance on a different set of objectives. Just as results of a decision analysis
 883 are conditioned on the assumptions used to simulate performance outcomes, the results of the
 884 decision analysis and plan rankings also depend in part upon what set of stakeholder weights are
 885 used in the multi-attribute utility function. Thus, it is also useful to examine the sensitivity of
 886 plan rankings to the weights on decision objectives. If plan rankings are not sensitive to the
 887 weights, this may suggest that the alternative may have a broad base of support among
 888 stakeholders.

889

890 3.5.3 Risk-Informed Decision Making

891

892 Decision analysis becomes more complicated when uncertainties are present because the utility of
893 each plan and its rank relative to other plans may vary with the states of environmental, social,
894 and policy variables used in modeling decision outcomes. Consequently, plans that were
895 dominated (e.g., have a lower utility score) under one set of modeling assumptions may be
896 preferred under another set of modeling assumptions. These modeling assumptions form a
897 planning scenario. In the face of uncertainty in these assumptions, the preferred alternative is the
898 one that maximizes *expected* utility. The expected utility of a decision alternative is:

899 $E[U_j] = \sum_{k=1}^K p(k)U_{jk}$. E is the expectation operator and U_j is the utility of the decision alternative

900 j for a given distribution of probabilities across K planning scenarios such that $\sum_{k=1}^K p(k) = 1$. U_{jk} is
901 the utility of the j^{th} decision alternative given the k^{th} planning scenario.

902

903 The calculation of expected utility requires a decision maker to assess the probability of each
904 planning scenario. However, if these probabilities are not known, the importance of uncertainty
905 in the decision can still be evaluated through sensitivity analysis to assess the robustness of the
906 conclusions. A decision alternative is robust if it remains optimal, or near-optimal, despite
907 changes in the allocation of probabilities to each planning scenario. In sensitivity analysis, the
908 analyst is concerned with how sensitive the decision is to changes in the inputs to the analysis,
909 although he presumes to know nothing about the uncertainty in those inputs. If the decision is
910 sensitive to modeling assumptions, this could suggest that more effort is needed to understand
911 these uncertainties before a decision is made. If there is little sensitivity, this should produce
912 confidence in the recommendations. However, the lack of any sensitivity might indicate the need
913 to re-evaluate the analytical approach.

914

915 In addition to uncertainty in the assumptions used to forecast plan performance, it is not
916 uncommon to have questions about what set of weights to use in the multi-attribute utility
917 function. In contrast to performance metrics, weights in a multi-attribute utility function are not
918 considered to be uncertain variables because, in theory, decision makers are assumed to know
919 their preferences. Nevertheless, it is usually advisable to assess the sensitivity of the decision to

920 changes in the weights because, in practice, it is often difficult to assess preferences with great
921 precision. In addition, when the decision maker must account for the preferences of multiple
922 stakeholders with competing interests, it is important to understand how different preferences
923 would lead to different decision outcomes.

924

925 Sensitivity analysis offers decision-makers and stakeholders a tangible understanding of the
926 relative importance of the metrics and the robustness of the ranking of alternatives in terms of
927 their cumulative scores. When used to answer questions of particular interest to decision-makers
928 and stakeholders, sensitivity analysis can be an effective tool for establishing confidence in
929 rankings and, ultimately, the decisions the planning process and rankings inform. For example, if
930 small changes in metric values or weights change the order of ranking then more qualification
931 would have to be attached to the ranking and the resulting recommendation. These methods also
932 provide a means to assess the value of reducing key uncertainties through further study, in
933 keeping with the objectives of adaptive management.

934

935 In the presentation of MCDA results that follows, the sensitivity of plan rankings to patterns of
936 preference (weight allocations) and to key planning assumptions including future rates of relative
937 sea level rise and patterns of development (*e.g.*, the employment growth rate and population
938 distribution) is investigated. The contribution of each metric to MAU and its influence on the
939 ordinal ranking of plans is assessed through the presentation of a series of bar charts that allow
940 comparisons to be made across plans, alternative patterns of preference, and planning scenarios.
941 These charts reveal that some plans are preferred by stakeholders despite differences in their
942 preference patterns for different reasons.

943

944 **3.6 Step 6 *Recommend a Plan***

945 Analysis of the project selection decision using the risk-informed decision process should provide
946 a basis for recommending a risk-reduction plan for each planning unit. This recommendation will
947 be based on all of the information assembled during the planning process including information
948 on stakeholder preferences, performance outcomes, and both risk and uncertainty. An advantage
949 of the RIDF is that the process of plan selection is a transparent and rational one. Decision

makers should be able to rely on the results of RIDF analysis as long as all of the factors, issues, and concerns of relevance have been accounted for among the decision objectives. Care should be taken to minimize the number of factors germane to a decision that remain outside the formal scoring and ranking process. In other words, the decision model implemented using MAUT should include as many of the concerns, objectives, and factors that are relevant to decision-making as possible. Given the large number of parties relevant to the decisions under consideration (The USACE, other Federal agencies, Congress, state, counties, cities, stakeholders, the public), great care must be taken to ensure that the planning process is comprehensive in its approach to the interests and values of these parties.

960

961 4. APPLICATION OF RIDF TO LACPR PROJECT 962 SELECTION

963 4.1 ***Stakeholder Workshops Activities Summary***

964

965 A series of workshops were held to capture stakeholder weights within each of the five LACPR
966 planning units. The objective of the workshops was to conduct sessions with key stakeholders
967 where their weights were elicited and their weight judgments summarized. The direct score
968 method was used to elicit these weights during all workshops. The workshop for Federal and
969 state agencies was held on 16 October in Baton Rouge, LA at the LaSalle Building, Griffon
970 Room. The workshop for Planning Units 1 and 2 was held on 22 October at the UNO Lindy
971 Boggs Building in New Orleans, LA. The workshop for Planning Units 3a and 3b was held on 23
972 October in Houma, LA at the Terrebonne Parish Government Tower. The workshop for Planning
973 Unit 4 was held on 24 October in Lake Charles, LA at the Carnegie Memorial Library. The
974 workshop for Planning Units 3b and 4 was held in Abbeville, LA at the Vermillion Parish
975 Library.

976

977 Stakeholder groups were selected for participation in this effort based on their participation in
978 previous LACPR stakeholder meetings. These groups and individuals were invited by the
979 LACPR team in advance to ensure diversity of opinions. Key stakeholder groups included
980 individuals from government (Federal, state, and local), non-governmental organizations (NGOs),
981 and individuals representing various environmental, business, development, and academic

982 institutions (see participation lists in Attachment 1). The USACE (LACPR Technical Team) also
983 submitted weights on the metrics set.

984

985 To kick off each stakeholder session, the LACPR Technical Team described the background and
986 purpose of the workshop and answered questions or concerns that arose. The LACPR Technical
987 Team used a slide presentation to describe a progress report of the investigation. We discussed
988 all the metrics in the metric set, its importance and clarified metric definitions as appropriate. We
989 also described the direct score weight process and how stakeholder weights will be generated
990 using this method. Weights were obtained for the final set of 14 metrics. We elicited and
991 received input from each of the stakeholder groups on the metric set and its completeness.
992

993 A series of “polls” were conducted. In the first of these, participants were asked to provide an
994 ordinal ranking of the 14 individual metrics from most to least important, where each participant
995 was asked to “wear the hat” of their job within their organization. The results were shared and
996 discussed briefly. Next, the stakeholders were asked to allocate points to each metric, thus
997 providing finer distinction of the relative importance of metrics. Allocation was done with three
998 rules. First, no individual metric could be given more than 70 points. Second, 100 points was
999 available for the sum total of points given to all metrics. Third, all 100 points must be used. The
1000 same process was used of first ranking and then allocating points to the “categorical” metrics
1001 (NED, RED, OSE, and EQ). Thus, each of the stakeholder sessions progressed according to the
1002 following weight elicitation activities:

1003

- 1004 • Round 1: rank 15 metrics from least to most important.
- 1005 • Round 2: allocate the 15 metrics using 0-100 scale.
- 1006 • Round 3: rank the 4 system of accounts from least to most important.
- 1007 • Round 4: allocate 4 accounts using 0-100 scale.

1008

1009 An intranet-based system was used to gather weight data from participants. Each participant
1010 accessed a dedicated PC to rank metrics. These results were compiled real-time and shared with
1011 the group so that weights could be discussed.

1012

1013 The LACPR Technical Team members attended to answer technical questions that arose and to
1014 document the process. Group Solutions facilitated each session and electronically elicited the
1015 weights from each of the stakeholder groups. Group Solutions compiled the resultant weights and
1016 submitted all results electronically to the LACPR Technical Team for analysis and reporting.

1017

1018 Following the workshops, input values for metrics were combined with information about values
1019 and weighting functions for the various metrics to generate an overall score for each plan being
1020 considered. These scores will allow for direct comparisons to be made across all measures/plans
1021 and to rank plans in relation to each other in terms of the degree to which they satisfy the
1022 objectives the LACPR metrics represent. Such scores can be used to evaluate measures or plans
1023 against the without project condition, as well as to compare the performance of individual
1024 measures or plans (see more detailed discussion below).

1025

1026 Session Participants and Organizations

1027 Tables A1-1 to A1-6 in Attachment 1 list in alphabetical order by location the people (and
1028 corresponding affiliation) who participated in the LACPR stakeholder sessions. Some of those
1029 listed in the tables collaborated while others started but did not complete the weighting process.

1030

1031 **4.2 Stakeholder Weightings**

1032

1033 This section of the appendix discusses the treatment of weight elicitation results. The objective of
1034 this analysis is to summarize weight elicitation results and identify distinct patterns of preferences
1035 that exist among stakeholders with respect to LACPR decision objectives. We used a cluster
1036 analysis to classify stakeholders with similar types of preferences. Cluster analysis provides an
1037 objective approach to classifying objects based on shared characteristics. By lumping
1038 stakeholders who expressed essentially similar sets of interests into a single group using an
1039 empirical clustering method, we were able to document characteristic preferences among
1040 stakeholders and more efficiently explore the sensitivity of the LACPR decision.

1041

1042 Several different clustering techniques are available and the application of different methods
1043 could lead to alternative groupings of stakeholders. The standard for evaluating cluster solutions

1044 is whether or not the resulting solutions can be explained and are meaningful in the context of
1045 their purpose. In this case, the objective of the analysis is to identify and document the existence
1046 of distinct patterns of preferences within the subject population and characterize preference
1047 patterns. Characteristic preference patterns are then used to analyze the sensitivity of the decision
1048 to stakeholder preferences. This enables the sensitivity analysis to focus only on those preference
1049 patterns that have been observed, while excluding from the analysis those that have not been
1050 observed. The data reduction also eliminates the duplication of effort associated with carrying
1051 out sensitivity analysis for preference patterns that are essentially similar.

1052

1053 A number of clustering techniques were tested to evaluate the sensitivity of clusters to the choice
1054 of clustering method. The selected method employs a hierarchical agglomerative clustering
1055 technique called Ward's minimum variance method. In this method, an initial cluster of two
1056 individuals is formed by considering all possible clusters of size two and combining those
1057 individuals that produce the least impairment in an objective function. In the subsequent stage,
1058 all possible combinations of two individuals and all possible combinations of three individuals
1059 that include the initial cluster are formed and the cluster that results in least impairment of the
1060 objective function is accepted. At each level of the hierarchy, the objective function is minimized
1061 over all partitions of the data (Dillon and Goldstein 1984, SAS 2004). Although slightly different
1062 methods might produce clusters consisting of somewhat different individuals, we found that
1063 different methods identified a set of clusters that differed in similar ways.

1064

1065 Clusters were tested using two versions of the weight data. We used the raw weights that were
1066 allocated through direct weight elicitation to the fourteen metrics and we used an aggregate
1067 weight statistic for each of the four planning objectives. Aggregate weights by planning objective
1068 represent the sum of weights allocated to individual metrics associated with National Economic
1069 Objectives (NED), Regional Economic Objectives (RED), Environmental Objectives (EQ), and
1070 Other Social Effects (OSE). When the weights are allocated by planning objective, the data have
1071 fewer dimensions and the clusters are more clearly delineated.

1072

1073 Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 describe two separate cluster analyses. Section 4.2.1 implements cluster
1074 analysis for a set of twenty-one stakeholders who participated in the elicitation session for state
1075 and federal agency personnel (Attachment 1). This analysis was done so that the LACPR

1076 Technical Team could analyze the decision for Internal Technical Review (ITR) considering only
1077 these stakeholders. The second analysis, described in Section 4.2.2, utilizes all weight elicitation
1078 results without regard to the affiliation of stakeholders.

1079

1080 **4.2.1 Analysis of Stakeholder Weights (Agency Stakeholders in Baton**
1081 **Rouge Workshop)**

1082

1083 The LACPR weight elicitation session at Baton Rouge yielded 21 complete sets of stakeholder
1084 weights on the set of fourteen metrics (Attachment 2). Analysis of these data produced four
1085 clusters suggesting natural groupings of stakeholders based on their preferences. Clusters were
1086 chosen such that the formation of each cluster explains at least four percent of the variation in
1087 respondent's allocation of weights to the aggregate planning objectives.

1088

1089 The clusters are illustrated in Figure 3(a), which shows the individual respondent weights arrayed
1090 in three-dimensional space. Results are not displayed in the OSE dimension because of relatively
1091 small differences in that dimension. The smallest clusters, C and D, contain three individuals
1092 each and the largest cluster, A, contains seven individuals (see Attachment 2 for more detail).
1093 Three respondents were classified as outliers and therefore not included in any particular cluster.


1094

1095 The differences between clusters are more apparent in Figure 3(b), which shows the mean weight
1096 for each aggregate planning objective and each cluster. The mean weights for each cluster are
1097 summarized in Table 5 for each aggregate planning objective. Figure 4 illustrates the mean
1098 weights along with 95% confidence bounds on the estimated means. This graph can be used to
1099 help develop explanations for why the different clusters emerged. For example, Group B places
1100 the highest weight on EQ and Group C places the highest weight on NED (see Section 5.1.3).

1101


1102 Mean weights on the fourteen metrics will be used to conduct sensitivity analysis of the multi-
1103 attribute utility function by cluster, enabling us to show how different sets of values might lead to
1104 different recommendations. Mean weights for each of the fourteen metrics are listed in Table 8.

1105



1106

(a)



1107

1108 Figure 3. Weight allocation arrayed in three dimensions showing four clusters (a) and mean
 1109 weight allocation for each cluster (b).

1110

1111 Table 5. Mean Weight for each Objective Category by Cluster.

Cluster	Respondents (Number)	Mean Weight On Aggregate Objective Categories			
		NED	RED	EQ	OSE
A	5	0.209	0.107	0.633	0.051
B	7	0.110	0.046	0.786	0.058


DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

C	3	0.390	0.177	0.327	0.107
D	3	0.197	0.170	0.463	0.170

1112 Note: Columns may not sum exactly to one because of rounding.

1113

1114



1115
 1116 Figure 4. Mean weights by aggregate planning objective for four clusters, A through D.
 1117 Uncertainty bounds represent 95% confidence limits on the estimated mean weight.

1118
 1119 Table 6. Mean Weight for each Metric by Cluster.

Metric	Description		Cluster			
		Class	A	B	C	D
1	Residual Damages	NED	0.05	0.02	0.18	0.1
2	Life-cycle Cost	NED	0.09	0.05	0.16	0.05
3	Construction Time	NED	0.07	0.04	0.06	0.05
4	Spatial Integrity	EQ	0.11	0.11	0.05	0.06
5	Direct Wetland Impacts	EQ	0.16	0.2	0.06	0.08
6	Wetlands Created and/or Protected	EQ	0.2	0.29	0.05	0.15
7	Indirect Impacts	EQ	0.12	0.17	0.05	0.09
8	Historic Properties Protected	EQ	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.06
9	Archaeological Sites Protected	EQ	0.02	0.01	0.09	0.03
10	Gross Regional Output Impacted	RED	0.04	0.01	0.06	0.05
11	Employment Impacted	RED	0.04	0.02	0.07	0.06
12	People's Earned Income Impacted	RED	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.06
13	Residual Population Impacted	OSE	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.12
14	Historic Districts Protected	OSE	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.05

1120 Note: Columns may not sum exactly to one due to rounding.

1121

1122 The cluster analysis associates each stakeholder with a group of individuals that have a similar set
1123 of priorities with respect to the four major planning objectives. The cluster analysis identified
1124 four (4) distinct groups of agency stakeholders based on their allocation of weights to the fourteen
1125 metrics aggregated by planning objective. Each natural group is described below in terms of its
1126 mean weight allocation to the four accounts, or objective categories (see Table 6 and Figures 3
1127 and 4).

- 1128 • Cluster A: These stakeholders tended to emphasize EQ objectives by giving them an
1129 aggregate mean weight of 0.633, but also tended to balance this emphasis by allocating
1130 0.209 to NED and 0.107 to RED objectives.
- 1131 • Cluster B: These stakeholders emphasized EQ objectives almost to the exclusion of other
1132 objectives. The average of weights allocated to EQ objectives was 0.786 while the
1133 average of weights allocated to RED (0.05) and NED (0.11) objectives were the lowest
1134 among the four clusters. This group also gave the second-lowest weight to OSE (0.06)
1135 objectives.
- 1136 • Cluster C: This group placed the highest priority on economic development objectives at
1137 both the national and regional levels. The mean weight allocated to NED and RED
1138 objectives was 0.39 and 0.177, respectively. This group had the lowest mean weight on
1139 EQ objectives (0.327).
- 1140 • Cluster D: Cluster D, like Clusters A and B, allocated the highest weight to EQ objectives,
1141 but emphasized OSE objectives almost as much as NED and RED objectives. Even so,
1142 weights for the NED (0.20), RED (0.17) and EQ (0.46) objectives were at least as high as
1143 that for OSE objectives.

1144

1145 **4.2.2 Analysis of Stakeholder Weights (All Weight Elicitation Sessions)**

1146

1147 The LACPR weight elicitation sessions yielded 115 complete sets of stakeholder weights on the
1148 set of fourteen metrics (Attachment 3). Analysis of these data produced eight clusters suggesting
1149 natural groupings of stakeholders based on their preferences. Clusters were chosen such that the
1150 formation of each cluster explains at least two percent of the variation in respondent's allocation
1151 of weights to the aggregate planning objectives.

1152

1153 The clusters are illustrated in Figure 5(a), which shows the individual respondent weights arrayed
1154 in three-dimensional space. Results are not displayed in the OSE dimension because of relatively
1155 small differences in that dimension. The smallest cluster, C, contains only four individuals and
1156 the largest cluster, B contains 21 individuals (see Attachment 2 for more detail). Twelve
1157 respondents were classified as outliers and therefore not included in any particular cluster.

1158

1159 The differences between clusters are more apparent in Figure 5(b), which shows the mean weight
1160 for each aggregate planning objective and each cluster. The mean weights for each cluster are
1161 summarized in Table 7 for each aggregate planning objective. Figure 6 illustrates the mean
1162 weights along with 95% confidence bounds on the estimated means. This graph can be used to
1163 help develop explanations for why the different clusters emerged. For example, group A places
1164 the highest weight on NED and Group B places the highest weight on RED (see Section 5.1.5).
1165 Although group D and F have similar weights on NED, RED, and EQ objectives they have
1166 significantly different mean weights on OSE objectives.


1167

1168 Mean weights on the fourteen metrics will be used in sensitivity analysis of the multi-attribute
1169 utility function by cluster, enabling us to show how different sets of values might lead to different
1170 recommendations. Mean weights for each of the fourteen metrics are listed in Table 8.

1171


1172

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix



(a)

1173
1174



(b)

1175
1176
1177

1178 Figure 5. Weight allocation arrayed in three dimensions showing eight clusters (a) and mean
 1179 weight allocation for each cluster (b)

1180

1181


1182 Table 7. Mean Weight for each Objective Category by Cluster.

Cluster	Respondents (Number)	Mean Weight On Aggregate Objective Categories			
		NED	RED	EQ	OSE
A	15	0.47	0.18	0.27	0.09
B	21	0.26	0.22	0.36	0.16
C	4	0.19	0.44	0.24	0.13
D	11	0.28	0.07	0.45	0.20
E	15	0.19	0.13	0.64	0.04
F	13	0.31	0.12	0.49	0.07
G	15	0.12	0.04	0.81	0.03
H	9	0.11	0.10	0.66	0.13

1183 Note: Twelve respondents are outliers. Columns may not sum to one due to rounding.

1184

1185



1186

1187

1188 Figure 6. Mean weights by aggregate planning objective for eight clusters, A through H.
 1189 Uncertainty bounds represent 95% confidence limits on the estimated mean weight.

1190

1191

Table 8. Mean Weight for each Metric by Cluster.

Metric Description	Class	Cluster							
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1 Residual Damages	NED	0.21	0.10	0.05	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.04	0.05
2 Life-Cycle Cost	NED	0.12	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.03	0.02
3 Construction Time	NED	0.14	0.09	0.10	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.05	0.04
4 Spatial Integrity	EQ	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.10	0.08	0.19	0.12
5 Direct Wetland Impacts	EQ	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.14	0.14	0.09	0.13	0.15
6 Wetlands Created or Protected	EQ	0.08	0.11	0.07	0.16	0.21	0.17	0.32	0.23

7	Indirect Impacts	EQ	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.14	0.08	0.14	0.12
8	Historic Properties Protected	EQ	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.03
9	Archaeological Sites Protected	EQ	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.02
10	Gross Regional Output Impacted	RED	0.07	0.08	0.20	0.02	0.06	0.05	0.02	0.03
11	Employment Impacted	RED	0.06	0.07	0.10	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.04
12	People's Earned Income Impacted	RED	0.05	0.07	0.14	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.03
13	Residual Population Impacted	OSE	0.07	0.11	0.11	0.18	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.10
14	Historic Districts Protected	OSE	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03

1192 Note: Twelve respondents are outliers. Columns may not sum to one due to rounding.

1193

1194

1195 The cluster analysis associates each stakeholder with a group of individuals that have a similar set
 1196 of priorities with respect to the four major planning objectives. The cluster analysis identified
 1197 eight (8) distinct groups of agency stakeholders based on their allocation of weights to the
 1198 fourteen metrics. Each natural group is described below in terms of its mean weight allocation to
 1199 the four accounts, or objective categories (see Table 7 and Figures 5 and 6).

- 1200 • Cluster A: This group focused on economic development at the national level, with the
 1201 highest NED weighting of 0.47. Weights for the other 3 categories were intermediate.
 1202 This group had the second-lowest weight for EQ (0.27).
- 1203 • Cluster B: This group was intermediate (not highest or lowest weight for any category),
 1204 allocating at least a weight of 0.15 to each category. It was unique in that it provided the
 1205 second-highest weights for both RED (0.22) and OSE (0.16).
- 1206 • Cluster C: Cluster C weighted RED the highest at 0.44 so it's focused on economic
 1207 development at the regional level. It provided intermediate weights (0.13 and 0.19) for
 1208 the OSE and NED categories and the lowest weight for EQ (0.24).
- 1209 • Cluster D: Cluster D weighted OSE the highest at 0.20. Even so, weights for the NED
 1210 (0.28) and EQ (0.45) categories were still higher than OSE.
- 1211 • Cluster E: This group had the third-highest EQ weighting of 0.64. This group also
 1212 weighted NED at 0.19 and RED at 0.13, distinguishing it from Group G and showing it to
 1213 also be relatively economically minded. Its low OSE score (0.04) also differentiates it
 1214 from Cluster H.
- 1215 • Cluster F: Like Cluster B, this cluster weighted each category as intermediate. It allocated
 1216 more for NED, but less for RED and OSE than Cluster B.

- Cluster G: This group is the most focused on the EQ category, showing the highest EQ weight of 0.81. This high EQ weighting comes at the expense of the other 3 categories, yielding the lowest weights for RED (0.04) and OSE (0.03) and second-lowest weight for NED (0.12).
- Cluster H: While this group focused on EQ, giving it the second-highest weight (0.66), this group also weighted (balanced) each of the other categories with at least a 0.10 weighting, which sets it apart from Cluster G.

4.3 Plan Rankings by MAU Score

In this analysis, an MAU score is calculated and plans are ranked by the MAU score. Plans with higher MAU scores are preferred, but these ranks assume a particular set of stakeholder preferences and planning assumptions. The calculation of MAU scores occurs in two stages. In the first stage, the coastal alternatives are ranked using a subset of the metrics and weights and a preferred coastal alternative is identified. The coastal alternative with the highest MAU score is selected. MAU is then calculated for each of the structural and nonstructural plans. This two-stage procedure is needed because some of the structural and nonstructural performance metrics depend upon what coastal alternative is selected.

4.3.1 Ranking of Coastal Alternatives

MAU scores were calculated for each of the coastal alternatives using the subset of decision attributes that varied over these alternatives. This set included three metrics: 1) present value cost of the coastal alternative; 2) the spatial integrity index; and 3) wetland acres created or protected. Weights for these metrics were taken from the set of fourteen weights elicited from stakeholders as described above and scaled to sum to one for the MAU calculation. Coastal alternatives were ranked by MAU score for each of the planning scenarios in each planning unit and the coastal alternative with the highest MAU score in each planning unit was selected for that planning unit. Results of these analyses are summarized in the discussion of plan selection results for the structural and nonstructural alternatives.

4.3.2 Ranking of Structural and Nonstructural Alternatives

MAU scores were calculated for each of the coastal, structural and nonstructural plans and the no-action alternative using a full set of fourteen weights and metrics. The alternatives are then ranked by MAU score, with the alternative having the highest MAU score being most preferred given the scenarios and preferences under consideration. However, these ranks should be interpreted with more caution than this because there are many uncertainties that have not been fully addressed in this analysis. Therefore, rather than focusing on identifying the top-ranked plan and choosing this as the “best” alternative, it may be more useful to consider other types of questions. For example:

- How much do the MAU scores vary across the alternatives?
- Is there a group of plans at the top that have MAU scores that are relatively close to one another? What are the similarities and differences of the plans that form this “top tier?”
- How sensitive are plan rankings to planning assumptions and stakeholder preferences?
- Do stakeholders with different preference patterns prefer one particular plan but for different reasons?

Results of the analysis are presented in the form of numerous tables and graphs that summarize the results for each planning unit so that they can be used to support these types of deliberations among decision makers and stakeholders.

The purpose of this introduction to the results is to familiarize the reader with the several presentation formats and facilitate the discussion. Detailed results for each planning unit are presented in the next several sections. Results are presented for each scenario and cluster using six types of tables and figures, including:

1. tables showing plans ranked by their MAU score;
2. tables showing “Consumer Reports” types of analysis;
3. figures showing the contribution of each metric to the MAU score;
4. tables showing the plan that maximizes the MAU score;
5. figures showing an expected MAU score and its range; and
6. figures showing the sensitivity of an MCDA that maximizes expected utility.

1279 **1. Tables Showing Plans Ranked by their MAU Score:** In this presentation format, the
 1280 plans are ranked by MAU score. There is one table for each of the four characteristic set
 1281 of preferences (GA-A, GA-B, etc.) as indicated in the upper left-hand corner of each table.
 1282 The table includes four rankings, one for each planning scenario. The scenarios are
 1283 indexed as in Table 4 in Section 3.2 of this report. For each scenario, the first column lists
 1284 the plan number (provided for each planning unit in the following presentation of results)
 1285 and the LACPR plan code with which it is associated. A description of each plan is
 1286 provided in the [Main Report](#). The MAU score in the third column is a measure of the
 1287 utility of each alternative and takes a value between zero and one. As described in Section
 1288 3.5.1, MAU is the weighted sum of scaled performance metrics, where the weights reflect
 1289 one of four sets of characteristic preferences identified among the stakeholders who
 1290 participated in the weight elicitation exercises. This type of analysis, in which alternatives
 1291 are ranked by a deterministic utility score, is replicated for each of the four scenarios
 1292 representing possible, but uncertain, future conditions that might affect performance. In
 1293 the illustrative example in Figure 7, stakeholders with preferences consistent with GA-A
 1294 would prefer Plan 6 (PU1-NS-400) under the assumptions of Scenario 1. However, the
 1295 second- and third-ranked plans provide nearly as much utility as the top-ranked plan. For
 1296 Scenario 3, the top-ranked plan changes. Under Scenario 3, which assumes a lower
 1297 employment growth rate during the planning horizon and a land use policy leading to a
 1298 dispersed population, stakeholders with these preferences would derive the greatest utility
 1299 from Plan 5 (PU1-NS-400).

1300

Cluster GA-A			Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility	Plan	Plan Code	Utility	Plan	Plan Code	Utility	Plan	Plan Code	Utility	Plan	Plan Code	Utility
6	PU1-NS-400	0.811	6	PU1-NS-400	0.804	5	PU1-NS-100	0.837	6	PU1-NS-400	0.816	6	PU1-NS-400	0.816
5	PU1-NS-100	0.810	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.804	6	PU1-NS-400	0.835	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.814	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.814
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.810	5	PU1-NS-100	0.798	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.832	5	PU1-NS-100	0.813	5	PU1-NS-100	0.813
2	PU1-R1	0.750	2	PU1-R1	0.736	2	PU1-R1	0.788	2	PU1-R1	0.774	2	PU1-R1	0.774
3	PU1-R2	0.746	3	PU1-R2	0.732	3	PU1-R2	0.784	3	PU1-R2	0.771	3	PU1-R2	0.771
4	PU1-R3	0.733	4	PU1-R3	0.719	4	PU1-R3	0.771	4	PU1-R3	0.758	4	PU1-R3	0.758
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.715	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.701	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.756	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.731	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.731
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.700	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.686	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.747	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.723	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.723
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.690	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.675	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.730	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.703	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.703
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.677	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.662	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.722	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.697	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.697
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.646	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.636	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.685	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.663	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.663
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.643	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.617	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.614	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.675	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.653
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.629	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.614	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.675	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.642	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.642
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.615	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.587	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.662	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.623	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.623
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.593	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.568	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.633	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.597	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.597
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.580	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.564	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.626	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.591	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.591
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.576	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.555	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.613	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.591	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.591
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.575	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.550	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.612	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.577	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.577
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.564	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.548	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.608	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.574	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.573
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.558	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.540	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.594	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.590	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.566
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.544	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.532	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.590	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.549	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.549
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.527	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.515	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.573	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.542	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.522
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.506	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.496	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.538	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.519	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.519
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.493	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.484	1	PU1-0	0.525	1	PU1-0	0.486	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.482
1	PU1-0	0.481	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.456	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.500	14	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.481	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.481
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.464	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.450	1	PU1-0	0.499	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.481			
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.457	1	PU1-0	0.436	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.499						

1301

Figure 7: Illustrative Example of Table: *Plans Ranked by MAU Score for Planning Unit and Cluster*

Tables Showing “Consumer Reports” Types of Analysis: More detail on plan rankings are provided in Attachments 4 – 9. These tables are a “Consumer Reports” type of analysis in which all of the plan alternatives under consideration are ranked by their MAU score for each characteristic set of preferences and planning scenario. Column one lists the plan number, column two lists the plan code, and column three lists the MAU score. The performance metrics associated with each outcome are listed in the left-hand columns and are numbered from 1 – 14 as shown in Table 9. The information in Table 9 applies to all tables, figures, and planning units. For some performance metrics (metrics 1, 10, 11, 12, and 13), the values differ from those provided. When the LACPR Technical Team provided confidence intervals on a metric to reflect uncertainty in the modeled stage frequency curve for storm surge, we calculated an expected value of the metric assuming an asymmetric triangular distribution to represent that uncertainty, extrapolating upper and lower bounds from the 10th and 90th percentile confidence bounds for each metric.

Plan	Plan Code	Utility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU1-NS-400	0.811	579151	51	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	328144	1667	85001	53294	50
5	PU1-NS-100	0.810	863308	25	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	653206	2857	167590	54527	50
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.810	532170	65	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	99321	1553	77217	46746	50
2	PU1-R1	0.750	1696702	9	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
3	PU1-R2	0.746	1696702	11	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
4	PU1-R3	0.733	1696702	15	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.715	1195272	33	12	0.445	-3642	233914	-1	133	271	1015087	4536	280490	53452	50
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.700	1461284	29	12	0.445	-3642	233914	-1	133	271	1217614	5182	323398	54741	50
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.690	1197582	36	12	0.445	-4686	233914	-2	143	273	989333	4454	271884	52519	50
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.677	1418528	32	12	0.445	-4686	233914	-2	143	273	1169442	5024	309917	53610	50
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.646	1139270	64	16	0.445	-5661	233914	-1	143	273	935066	4276	259110	52901	50
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.643	1185545	27	14	0.445	-980	233914	-8	133	231	1050337	4591	289686	54725	50
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.629	1427975	58	16	0.445	-5661	233914	-1	143	273	1171181	5037	312121	54462	50
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.615	1542812	22	14	0.445	-980	233914	-8	133	231	1421589	5902	374114	56917	50
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.593	1223270	40	14	0.445	-3668	233914	-8	133	271	1049819	4688	291033	53028	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.580	1447693	35	14	0.445	-3668	233914	-8	133	271	1242613	5309	332087	54551	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.576	1086298	50	16	0.445	-4238	233914	-8	137	233	869709	3970	241444	54053	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.575	1226316	43	14	0.445	-4541	233914	-8	133	231	1021151	4586	28090	52357	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.564	1419610	37	14	0.445	-4541	233914	-8	133	231	1195432	5136	317983	53682	50
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.558	1074066	59	16	0.445	-5100	233914	-8	137	273	858247	3928	238414	53429	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.544	1498743	41	16	0.445	-4238	233914	-8	137	233	1342300	5629	353747	56335	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.527	1496191	48	16	0.445	-5100	233914	-8	137	273	1339226	5617	352890	56288	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.506	1156847	68	16	0.445	-7587	233914	-8	146	233	935042	4264	258323	52459	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.493	1399093	59	16	0.445	-7587	233914	-8	146	233	1172002	5050	313300	54022	50
1	PU1-0	0.481	1834963	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	126	91	1881351	7217	496578	62905	46
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.464	1165482	82	16	0.445	-10081	233914	-8	159	273	942025	4305	260292	51543	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.457	1368630	72	16	0.445	-10081	233914	-8	159	273	1125709	4879	299622	53165	50

Figure 8: Illustrative Table showing a “Consumer Reports” Type of Analysis

1320

1321

1322

1323

Table 9. Metric Numbers and Metric Names.

Metric	Metric Name
1	Residual Damages (\$ 1000's)
2	Life-cycle Cost (\$ Billions)
3	Construction Time (Years)
4	Spatial Integrity (dim)
5	Direct Wetland Impacts (acres)
6	Wetlands Created/ Protected (acres)
7	Indirect Impacts (dim)
8	Historic Properties Protected (Number)
9	Archeological Sites Protected (Number)
10	Gross Regional Output Impacted (\$ 1000's)
11	Employment Impacted (Number)
12	People's Earned Income Impacted (\$ 1000's)
13	Resident Population Impacted (Number)
14	Historic Districts Protected (Number)

1324

1325

1326

3. **Figures Showing the Contribution of Each Metric to the MAU Score:** This figure shows how much of the MAU score can be attributed to performance on each metric. These metrics are numbered as shown in Table 9. Plans are shown ranked from left to right in terms of decreasing MAU score. The color coding of the bars shows the relative contribution of each metric to the MAU score. Although a plan may perform well on an objective, a stakeholder who places little or no weight on that objective will derive little or no utility from that aspect of performance. In this case, there will be little or no contribution of a metric to the MAU score and the color-coded metric may be difficult to see in this figure. In some cases, a metric may show consistently high performance on an objective for all plans. For example, this is true of metric 6 (Wetlands Created and Protected) in Figure 9 [below]. This demonstrates another point to consider when interpreting plan rankings. Although a metric contributes to the MAU score, it may have little or no impact on plan rankings if there is not much variation in the performance on that metric across the decision alternatives. Although stakeholders derive utility from the outcome, performance on that objective will have little or not impact on the decision.

1331

1333

1336


1337

1338

1339

1340

1341



1342

1343 Figure 9: Illustrative Example of the Figure: *Contributions of Metrics to the MAU Score*

1344

1345 **4. Tables Showing the Plan that Maximizes the MAU Score:** This table illustrates the
 1346 sensitivity of the decision to the planning assumptions for each cluster. Figure 10 shows
 1347 that, for Cluster GA-A, if a lower rate of relative sea level rise and a high employment
 1348 growth rate leading to a dispersed population are assumed, the coastal alternative PU1-
 1349 NS-400 maximizes utility with PU1-R3 as the coastal alternative. This conclusion is
 1350 sensitive to the employment and population dispersion assumptions but not to changes in
 1351 relative sea level rise. No information is being presented in this table that has not been
 1352 previously presented above, but in some ways these tables make it easier to assess
 1353 sensitivity.

1354

Cluster GA-A	Relative Sea Level Rise	
	Lower	Higher
Pattern of Development		
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU1-NS-400 (PU1-R3)	PU1-NS-400 (PU1-R3)
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU1-NS-100 (PU1-R2)	PU1-NS-400 (PU1-R3)

1355

1356 Figure 10: Illustrative Example of the Table: *Table of Preferred Plans*


1357

1358 **5. Figures Showing the Expected MAU Score and Range:** In a decision analysis with
 1359 uncertainty, the preferred alternative is the one that maximizes expected utility. This type

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

of figure is illustrated in Figure 11 which plots the expected utility of each alternative for a hypothetical allocation of probability to each of the two relative sea level rise scenarios ($P(RSLR = \text{Lower}) = 0.5$ and $P(RSLR = \text{Higher}) = 0.5$) for one of the characteristic sets of preferences. In this analysis, we calculate expected utility for each of the development scenarios treating RSLR as uncertain. Figure 11 illustrates how the utility of some alternatives may be more or less sensitive to relative sea level rise assumptions than the utility of other alternatives. The error bands on expected utility represent the minimum and maximum levels of utility over the four scenarios considered in this analysis.

Alternatives that are more sensitive to relative sea level rise and development assumptions will have larger error bands and those alternatives with narrow error bands yield the most predictable levels of utility. For example, in Figure 11, Plans 5, 6 and 7 have narrow error bands for all four clusters. Alternatives that have expected utilities with smaller ranges represent more predictable outcomes. These alternatives (for example, Plan 7 in Figure 12) may be preferred to others that have larger ranges (for example, Plan 2) because these alternatives lead to more predictable outcomes.



1375

Figure 11: Expected Utility of each Plan showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).

1378

1379 **6. Figures Showing the Sensitivity of an MCDA that Maximizes Expected Utility:** This
1380 figure shows how the decision changes in response to the distribution of probabilities
1381 across the relative sea level rise scenarios for the High Employment and Dispersed
1382 Population scenario (Scenarios 3 & 4). In this figure, each cell indicates what plan (by

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1383 plan number) maximizes expected utility for the indicated preferences. For example, the
 1384 first row assumes preferences that are consistent with those of GA-A. The second row
 1385 shows which plan maximizes utility for preferences consistent with GA-B. In this case,
 1386 the decision is sensitive to the allocation of probabilities to the relative sea level rise
 1387 scenarios. When $P(RSLR = \text{Higher}) \geq 0.4$, the preferred alternative changes from Plan 5 to
 1388 either Plan 6 or Plan 7, depending upon what pattern of preference is assumed. Results of
 1389 the MCDA are insensitive to assumptions about the rate of relative sea level rise when
 1390 preferences are consistent with GA-C and GA-D. Although a decision maker may not
 1391 have precise knowledge about the probabilities associated with the scenarios, it is still
 1392 possible to inform a decision by thinking in less precise terms and characterizing the
 1393 decision landscape.

1394

PU1, Scenarios 3 & 4: BAU Employment and Compact Population											
	Probability (RSLR = Higher)										
Cluster	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
GA-A	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6
GA-B	5	5	5	5	5	7	7	7	7	7	7
GA-C	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
GA-D	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

1395

1396 Figure 12: Sensitivity of an MCDA that Maximizes Expected Utility

1397

1398

1399

1400 **4.3.3 Summary of Results for Planning Unit 1**

1401

1402 MAU scores were calculated for each of the coastal, structural, and nonstructural plans and the
1403 no-action alternative using a full set of fourteen weights and metrics. In the discussion of PU-1
1404 results that follows, plans are numbered 1-27 as indicated in Table 10. Plans are ranked by MAU
1405 for each planning scenario and characteristic set of preferences in Tables 11-14.

1406

1407 Table 10. Plan Numbers and Plan Names.
1408

Plan	Plan Code
1	PU1-0
2	PU1-R1
3	PU1-R2
4	PU1-R3
5	PU1-NS-100
6	PU1-NS-400
7	PU1-NS-1000
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3

1409

1410

1411 Figures 13-16 show the contribution of each metric to utility for each plan, scenario, and cluster.
1412 For example, Figure 13 illustrates the contribution of each metric to utility given preferences

1413 consistent with the canonical weights of Group GA-A² (Cluster A in Section 4.2.1) and the
1414 planning assumptions consistent with Scenario 1 (Lower RSLR and High Employment/Dispersed
1415 Population). The utility of Plan 6 for a GA-A decision maker given Scenario 1 is 0.811. This
1416 result can also be seen in Table 11, which lists utility for Group GA-A. Figure 13 shows the
1417 contribution of performance outcomes to the overall utility score. Although a plan may
1418 contribute substantially towards one of the decision objectives, if preference weights reflect
1419 relatively little emphasis on that objective, the performance with respect to that decision objective
1420 will have little impact on overall utility.

1421

1422 For clusters GA-A, GA-B, GA-C and GA-D, the three top-ranking plans are those that include a
1423 combination of coastal and nonstructural measures: Plan 5, Plan 6 and Plan 7 (Figures 13-16).
1424 For Group GA-A, GA-B, and GA-C, the rank order of these Plans depends upon scenario
1425 assumptions. This sensitivity is not shared by Group GA-D, where Plans 7, 6 and 5 are scored
1426 highest in ascending order. Metrics most contributing to the MAU scores for Groups GA-A and
1427 GA-B were spatial integrity (No. 4), direct wetland impacts (No. 5), wetlands created/protected
1428 (No. 6) and indirect impacts (No. 7). Direct wetland impacts (No. 5), wetlands created/protected
1429 (No. 6), indirect impacts (No. 7) metrics also substantially contributed to Group D scores, along
1430 with resident population impacted (No. 13). Although a particular metric may make substantial
1431 contributions toward overall utility, performance metrics that do not vary among decision
1432 alternatives will tend to have little impact on plan rankings. This holds true for spatial integrity
1433 (No. 4) and wetlands created/protected (No. 6). Although these metrics contribute to the MAU
1434 score, they have little influence on the ranking of structural and nonstructural alternatives because
1435 they do not vary.

1436

1437 Results from Group GA-C are similar to those for Groups GA-A, GA-B and GA-D (Table 13 and
1438 Figure 15), with the top ranking plans being Plans 5, 6 and 7. The rank order for these three
1439 groups was also sensitive to scenario assumptions. The metric most contributing to MAU of the
1440 top –ranked plans for GA-C was residual damages (No. 1).

² The prefix GA in the cluster identifier indicates that these cluster weights are based on stakeholder weights elicited from individuals with a government agency affiliation who participated in the Baton Rouge Session.

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1441 Table 11. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-1, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-A

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
6	PU1-NS-400	0.811	6	PU1-NS-400	0.804	5	PU1-NS-100	0.837	6	PU1-NS-400	0.816
5	PU1-NS-100	0.810	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.804	6	PU1-NS-400	0.835	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.814
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.810	5	PU1-NS-100	0.798	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.832	5	PU1-NS-100	0.813
2	PU1-R1	0.750	2	PU1-R1	0.736	2	PU1-R1	0.788	2	PU1-R1	0.774
3	PU1-R2	0.746	3	PU1-R2	0.732	3	PU1-R2	0.784	3	PU1-R2	0.771
4	PU1-R3	0.733	4	PU1-R3	0.719	4	PU1-R3	0.771	4	PU1-R3	0.758
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.715	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.701	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.756	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.731
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.700	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.686	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.747	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.723
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.690	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.675	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.730	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.703
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.677	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.662	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.722	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.697
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.646	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.636	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.685	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.663
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.643	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.617	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.682	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.653
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.629	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.614	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.675	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.642
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.615	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.587	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.662	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.623
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.593	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.568	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.633	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.597
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.580	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.564	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.626	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.591
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.576	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.555	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.613	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.591
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.575	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.550	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.612	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.577
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.564	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.548	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.608	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.574
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.558	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.540	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.594	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.573
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.544	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.532	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.590	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.566
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.527	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.515	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.573	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.549
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.506	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.496	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.542	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.522
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.493	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.484	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.538	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.519
1	PU1-0	0.481	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.456	1	PU1-0	0.525	1	PU1-0	0.486
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.464	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.450	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.500	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.482
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.457	1	PU1-0	0.436	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.499	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.481

1442

1443

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1444 Table 12. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-1, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-B

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.877	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.874	5	PU1-NS-100	0.890	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.883
5	PU1-NS-100	0.875	6	PU1-NS-400	0.870	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.888	5	PU1-NS-100	0.882
6	PU1-NS-400	0.873	5	PU1-NS-100	0.869	6	PU1-NS-400	0.886	6	PU1-NS-400	0.881
2	PU1-R1	0.844	2	PU1-R1	0.837	2	PU1-R1	0.871	2	PU1-R1	0.864
3	PU1-R2	0.839	3	PU1-R2	0.833	3	PU1-R2	0.866	3	PU1-R2	0.860
4	PU1-R3	0.836	4	PU1-R3	0.830	4	PU1-R3	0.862	4	PU1-R3	0.856
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.774	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.767	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.798	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.789
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.766	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.760	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.793	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.785
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.736	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.729	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.759	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.750
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.730	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.723	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.755	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.746
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.712	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.710	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.735	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.730
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.704	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.701	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.730	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.725
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.672	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.653	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.695	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.674
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.659	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.640	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.685	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.664
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.616	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.600	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.639	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.620
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.610	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.596	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.636	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.618
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.598	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.593	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.619	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.615
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.597	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.581	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.619	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.601
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.592	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.581	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.617	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.599
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.584	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.578	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.609	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.596
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.579	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.576	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.600	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.585
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.564	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.562	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.590	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.543
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.524	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.523	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.545	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.542
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.519	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.518	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.544	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.493
1	PU1-0	0.481	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.474	1	PU1-0	0.511	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.492
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.474	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.471	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.495	1	PU1-0	0.488
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.471	1	PU1-0	0.455	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.494			

1445

1446

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1447 Table 13. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-1, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-C

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.764	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.753	6	PU1-NS-400	0.785	6	PU1-NS-400	0.774
6	PU1-NS-400	0.762	6	PU1-NS-400	0.750	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.783	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.773
5	PU1-NS-100	0.750	5	PU1-NS-100	0.725	5	PU1-NS-100	0.779	5	PU1-NS-100	0.756
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.664	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.636	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.719	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.695
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.659	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.632	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.711	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.687
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.624	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.598	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.693	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.670
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.622	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.596	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.689	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.666
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.616	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.571	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.668	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.622
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.596	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.565	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.646	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.621
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.594	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.554	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.644	2	PU1-R1	0.613
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.575	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.550	2	PU1-R1	0.642	3	PU1-R2	0.610
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.575	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.546	3	PU1-R2	0.639	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.610
2	PU1-R1	0.569	2	PU1-R1	0.540	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.627	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.598
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.568	3	PU1-R2	0.537	4	PU1-R3	0.623	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.598
3	PU1-R2	0.566	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.530	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.622	4	PU1-R3	0.593
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.558	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.522	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.620	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.593
4	PU1-R3	0.550	4	PU1-R3	0.521	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.617	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.591
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.549	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.519	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.616	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.582
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.547	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.501	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.613	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.569
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.538	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.500	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.603	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.568
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.514	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.489	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.562	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.538
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.499	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.477	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.561	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.532
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.498	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.467	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.559	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.531
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.498	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.466	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.545	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.524
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.480	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.456	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.542	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.523
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.477	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.455	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.538	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.519
1	PU1-0	0.416	1	PU1-0	0.330	1	PU1-0	0.500	1	PU1-0	0.425

1448

1449

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1450 Table 14. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-1, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-D

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.828	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.806	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.850	7	PU1-NS-1000	0.831
6	PU1-NS-400	0.798	6	PU1-NS-400	0.775	6	PU1-NS-400	0.827	6	PU1-NS-400	0.808
5	PU1-NS-100	0.764	5	PU1-NS-100	0.731	5	PU1-NS-100	0.798	5	PU1-NS-100	0.770
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.687	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.645	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.745	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.713
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.683	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.645	25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.744	26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.708
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.666	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.639	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.726	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.700
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.657	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.615	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.723	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.692
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.648	15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.611	27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.721	16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.691
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.626	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.597	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.697	17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.675
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.609	2	PU1-R1	0.570	2	PU1-R1	0.692	2	PU1-R1	0.655
2	PU1-R1	0.607	3	PU1-R2	0.568	3	PU1-R2	0.689	3	PU1-R2	0.653
3	PU1-R2	0.604	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.567	4	PU1-R3	0.685	4	PU1-R3	0.649
4	PU1-R3	0.600	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.566	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.667	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.627
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.595	4	PU1-R3	0.563	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.650	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.626
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.593	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.556	21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.648	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.613
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.592	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.546	23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.645	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.606
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.583	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.536	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.638	18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.601
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.574	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.528	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.632	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.600
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.570	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.527	24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.625	20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.592
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.559	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.520	22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.624	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.587
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.554	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.511	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.623	19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.581
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.550	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.495	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.622	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.574
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.547	10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.495	14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.612	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.570
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.535	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.492	12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.604	9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.566
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.526	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.491	11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.595	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.566
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.521	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.480	13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.590	8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.558
1	PU1-0	0.354	1	PU1-0	0.267	1	PU1-0	0.449	1	PU1-0	0.374


1451

1452

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1453 Figure 13: Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-A by Scenario for PU-1 (Baton Rouge,
1454 only)




1455
1456

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1457 Figure 14: Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-B by Scenario for PU-1 (Baton Rouge,
1458 only)




1459
1460

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1461 Figure 15. Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-C by Scenario for PU-1 (Baton Rouge,
1462 only)




1463

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1464

1465 Figure 16. Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-D by Scenario, PU-1 (Baton Rouge, only)



1466

4.3.3.1 Identification of Preferred Alternatives – Planning Unit 1

Table 15 shows the preferred alternatives over four possible relative sea level rise and development scenarios. Each cell indicates the preferred alternative given the scenario and the coastal alternative in parenthesis. For example, for Cluster GA-A, plan PU1-NS-400 (Plan 6) is preferred regardless of relative rate of relative sea level rise under the High Employment growth rate scenario. This table shows that, for Group D, the preference for plan PU1-NS-1000 (Plan 7) is insensitive to the assumptions made about either relative sea level rise or the employment growth rate. However, the decision is sensitive to scenario assumptions for Groups B and C. For Cluster GA-B, if a BAU employment growth rate is assumed, the preferred alternative depends upon relative sea level rise, with plan PU1-NS-1000 (Plan 7) preferred under Higher relative sea level rise assumptions while plan PU1-NS-100 (Plan 5) is preferred under Lower relative sea level rise assumptions. For Cluster GA-C, the preferred alternative depends upon the employment growth rate, with plan PU1-NS-1000 (Plan 7) preferred if a High Employment growth rate and a Dispersed Population is assumed while plan PU1-NS-400 (Plan 6) is preferred if a Business as Usual Employment growth rate and Compact Population are assumed.

Table 15. Preferred Plan Matrix for Four Clusters.

Cluster GA-A		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU1-NS-400 (PU1-R3)	PU1-NS-400 (PU1-R3)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU1-NS-100 (PU1-R2)	PU1-NS-400 (PU1-R3)	

Cluster GA-B		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU1-NS-1000 (PU1-R3)	PU1-NS-1000 (PU1-R3)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU1-NS-100 (PU1-R2)	PU1-NS-1000 (PU1-R3)	

Cluster GA-C		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU1-NS-1000 (PU1-R1)	PU1-NS-1000 (PU1-R1)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU1-NS-400 (PU1-R1)	PU1-NS-400 (PU1-R1)	

Cluster GA-D		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU1-NS-1000 (PU1-R1)	PU1-NS-1000 (PU1-R1)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU1-NS-1000 (PU1-R2)	PU1-NS-1000 (PU1-R1)	

1485

1486

1487 **4.3.3.2 *Expected Utility – Planning Unit 1***

1488


1489 In a decision analysis with uncertainty, the preferred alternative is the one that maximizes
 1490 expected utility. In this analysis, we calculate expected utility for each of the development
 1491 scenarios treating RSLR as uncertain. Our ability to address uncertainty in the development
 1492 patterns is limited because these scenarios are associated with the extreme values of the regional
 1493 economy metrics. This reduced set of development scenarios was necessitated by logistical and
 1494 resource constraints.

1495


1496 Figures 17-20 plot the expected utility of each alternative given an allocation of probability to
 1497 each of the two relative sea level rise scenarios ($P(RSLR = \text{Lower}) = 0.5$ and $P(RSLR = \text{Higher})$
 1498 = 0.5) for each the characteristic stakeholder groups. These four figures illustrate the expected
 1499 utility of each alternative given a High Employment and Dispersed Population scenario.
 1500 (BAU/Compact was not generated.) These figures illustrate how the utility of some alternatives
 1501 may be more or less sensitive to relative sea level rise assumptions than the utility of other
 1502 alternatives. The error bands on expected utility represent the minimum and maximum levels of
 1503 utility over the four scenarios considered in the LACPR plan. Alternatives that are more sensitive
 1504 to relative sea level rise and development assumptions will have larger error bands and those

1505 alternatives with narrow error bands yield the most predictable levels of utility. For example,
1506 Plans 5, 6 and 7 have narrow error bands for all four clusters. The expected utility of any given
1507 alternative and its range of possible values depends in part upon what set of weights is chosen.
1508
1509 The calculation of expected utility requires the assignment of probability to each scenario, but in
1510 this case our interest is not in any particular set of probabilities. Rather, our interest is in
1511 understanding how the different alternatives perform under different allocations of probability to
1512 the scenarios. For example, a change in the probabilities might cause expected utility for some
1513 alternatives to increase while causing expected utility for other alternatives to decrease. We are
1514 also interested in the range of expected utility for each scenario. The expected utilities shown in
1515 these figures assume high employment/dispersed populations. Alternatives that have expected
1516 utilities with smaller ranges represent more predictable outcomes. These alternatives (for
1517 example, Plan 7 in Figure 18) may be preferred to others that have larger ranges (for example,
1518 Plan 2) because these alternatives lead to more predictable outcomes.
1519
1520

1521 Figure 17: Expected Utility of each PU-1 Alternative for Cluster GA-A, showing minimum and
 1522 maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).



1523 Figure 18: Expected Utility of each PU-1 Alternative for Cluster GA-B, showing minimum and
 1524 maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).
 1525



1526
 1527

Figure 19: Expected Utility of each PU-1 Alternative for Cluster GA-C, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).





Figure 20: Expected Utility of each PU-1 Alternative for Cluster GA-D, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).



4.3.3.3 Sensitivity of Decisions to Assumptions about the Probability of Higher Levels of Relative Sea Level Rise – Planning Unit 1

Table 16 shows the sensitivity of the preferred alternative to assumptions about the allocation of probabilities to relative sea level rise scenarios for each cluster and for each development scenario. For the High Employment and Dispersed Population scenario (Scenarios 1 & 2), the decision is insensitive for all stakeholder groups. Under Scenarios 3 and 4, the preferred alternative for clusters GA-A and GA-B switches between $P(RSLR = \text{Higher}) = 0.4$ and $P(RSLR = \text{Higher}) = 0.5$. A decision maker who has preferences that are consistent with those of either Cluster GA-A or GA-B and who believes that the $P(RSLR = \text{Higher}) < 0.4$ would prefer Alternative 5. This illustrates an important point. Although a decision maker may not have precise knowledge about the probabilities associated with the scenarios, it is still possible to inform a decision by thinking in less precise terms.

Table 16. Preferred Plan Matrix for PU-1

Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment and Dispersed Population
 Probability (RSLR = Higher)

Cluster	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
GA-A	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
GA-B	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
GA-C	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
GA-D	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

Scenarios 3 & 4: BAU Employment and Compact Population
 Probability (RSLR = Higher)

Cluster	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
GA-A	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6
GA-B	5	5	5	5	5	7	7	7	7	7	7
GA-C	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
GA-D	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

23

24 **4.3.4 Ranking of Structural and Nonstructural Plans - Planning Unit 2**

25

26 MAU scores were calculated for each of the structural and nonstructural plans and the no-action
27 alternative using a full set of fourteen weights and metrics. In the discussion of PU-2 results that
28 follows, plans are numbered 1 – 33 as indicated in Table 17 to facilitate discussion.

29

30 Table 17. Plan Numbers and Plan Names.
31

Plan	Plan Code
31	PU2-C-R-100-3
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1
8	PU2-WBI-100-1
22	PU2-C-R-100-2
24	PU2-C-R-100-4
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1
33	PU2-C-R-400-3
5	PU2-NS-100
9	PU2-R-100-2
18	PU2-R-100-3
7	PU2-NS-1000
6	PU2-NS-400
11	PU2-R-100-4
23	PU2-C-R-400-2
4	PU2-R3
28	PU2-C-G-100-4
27	PU2-C-G-100-1
20	PU2-R-400-3
25	PU2-C-R-400-4
3	PU2-R2
19	PU2-WBI-400-1
10	PU2-R-400-2
14	PU2-G-100-1
2	PU2-R1
12	PU2-R-400-4
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4
15	PU2-G-100-4
17	PU2-R-1000-4
29	PU2-C-G-400-4
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4
16	PU2-G-400-4
13	PU2-G-1000-4
1	PU2-0

32

33

34

35 Plans are ranked by MAU for each characteristic stakeholder group in Tables 18-21. In each of
36 the four sub-tables, the first column gives the plan number, the second column gives the plan
37 code, and the third column gives the MAU score. The MAU score provides a measure of the
38 relative value of each alternative and takes a value between zero and one. More detail on these
39 rankings is provided in Tables A5-1 to A5 16 in Attachment 5. Tables 18-21 illustrate a
40 “Consumer Reports” type of analysis that ranks the 33 alternatives under consideration in
41 Planning Unit 2 by their overall utility to each characteristic stakeholder group. Utility provides a
42 measure of the relative value of each alternative and takes a value between zero and one. The
43 fourteen columns to the right are attributes of the decision outcome. Utility is the weighted sum
44 of scaled performance metrics for these attributes, where the weights reflect expressed
45 preferences of one of the four characteristic stakeholder groups identified in Section 4.2.1.
46 Alternatives with higher overall utility are preferred to those with lower utility scores. This type
47 of analysis, in which alternatives are ranked by a deterministic utility score, is replicated for each
48 of the four scenarios representing possible, but uncertain, future conditions.

49

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

50 Table 18. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-2, Cluster GA-A.

Cluster GA-A

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.835	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.833	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.805	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.846
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.825	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.819	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.805	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.842
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.799	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.794	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.786	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.825
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.798	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.792	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.779	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.816
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.785	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.780	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.763	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.801
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.776	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.775	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.761	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.800
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.775	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.773	4	PU2-R3	0.761	18	PU2-R-100-3	0.794
5	PU2-NS-100	0.774	5	PU2-NS-100	0.771	5	PU2-NS-100	0.748	5	PU2-NS-100	0.788
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.773	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.768	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.746	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.786
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.769	18	PU2-R-100-3	0.764	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.745	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.785
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.762	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.762	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.744	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.784
6	PU2-NS-400	0.761	6	PU2-NS-400	0.761	3	PU2-R2	0.738	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.774
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.758	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.754	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.731	6	PU2-NS-400	0.773
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.732	4	PU2-R3	0.728	6	PU2-NS-400	0.731	4	PU2-R3	0.759
4	PU2-R3	0.730	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.727	2	PU2-R1	0.719	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.747
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.727	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.726	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.709	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.737
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.715	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.709	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.707	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.736
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.711	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.707	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.695	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.731
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.711	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.706	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.694	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.731
3	PU2-R2	0.708	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.700	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.693	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.728
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.706	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.697	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.690	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.726
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.702	2	PU2-R1	0.687	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.688	2	PU2-R1	0.718
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.689	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.686	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.677	3	PU2-R2	0.717
2	PU2-R1	0.688	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.681	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.673	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.716
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.686	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.672	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.654	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.711
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.676	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.665	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.654	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.694
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.668	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.647	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.638	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.693
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.651	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.603	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.571	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.677
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.603	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.560	16	PU2-G-400-4	0.528	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.613
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.560	16	PU2-G-400-4	0.538	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.526	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.568
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.541							16	PU2-G-400-4	0.567

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.497	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.494	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.484	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.523
1	PU2-0	0.418	1	PU2-0	0.396	1	PU2-0	0.463	1	PU2-0	0.446

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

51 Table 19. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-2, Cluster GA-B.

Cluster GA-B

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.896	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.896	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.842	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.905
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.878	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.876	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.831	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.893
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.873	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.871	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.826	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.887
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.867	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.866	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.824	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.886
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.862	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.861	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.819	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.880
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.857	18	PU2-R-100-3	0.856	18	PU2-R-100-3	0.812	18	PU2-R-100-3	0.874
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.855	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.854	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.807	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.869
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.843	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.842	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.799	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.861
5	PU2-NS-100	0.829	5	PU2-NS-100	0.829	5	PU2-NS-100	0.779	5	PU2-NS-100	0.842
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.826	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.828	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.772	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.836
6	PU2-NS-400	0.826	6	PU2-NS-400	0.827	6	PU2-NS-400	0.772	6	PU2-NS-400	0.835
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.821	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.822	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.766	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.829
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.816	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.816	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.761	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.824
4	PU2-R3	0.809	4	PU2-R3	0.809	4	PU2-R3	0.745	4	PU2-R3	0.829
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.795	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.793	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.739	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.807
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.783	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.782	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.738	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.800
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.781	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.780	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.731	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.799
3	PU2-R2	0.775	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.772	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.731	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.792
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.774	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.772	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.724	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.786
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.774	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.760	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.718	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.779
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.762	2	PU2-R1	0.748	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.737	2	PU2-R1	0.768
2	PU2-R1	0.747	3	PU2-R2	0.746	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.724	3	PU2-R2	0.766
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.738	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.737	27	PU2-R-1000-4	0.688	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.750
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.726	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.724	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.681	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.743
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.722	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.721	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.674	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.736
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.720	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.720	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.667	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.729
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.711	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.710	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.665	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.729
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.685	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.684	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.640	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.703
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.591	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.592	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.535	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.599
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.554	16	PU2-G-400-4	0.553	16	PU2-G-400-4	0.509	16	PU2-G-400-4	0.572
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.544	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.545	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.487	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.551

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.506	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.505	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.461	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.524
1	PU2-0	0.411	1	PU2-0	0.399	1	PU2-0	0.438	1	PU2-0	0.429

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

52 Table 20. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-2, Cluster GA-C.

Cluster GA-C

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.765	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.757	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.784	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.782
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.750	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.741	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.772	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.769
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.723	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.716	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.744	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.741
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.712	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.705	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.741	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.730
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.696	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.679	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.735	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.729
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.694	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.675	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.732	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.725
5	PU2-NS-100	0.681	5	PU2-NS-100	0.670	5	PU2-NS-100	0.715	5	PU2-NS-100	0.710
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.670	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.665	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.703	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.693
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.669	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.663	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.698	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.693
6	PU2-NS-400	0.668	6	PU2-NS-400	0.662	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.696	6	PU2-NS-400	0.691
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.657	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.641	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.694	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.689
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.656	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.640	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.694	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.687
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.640	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.634	6	PU2-NS-400	0.693	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.686
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.627	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.612	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.687	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.685
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.624	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.610	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.687	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.681
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.622	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.610	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.659	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.653
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.619	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.603	18	PU2-R-100-3	0.657	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.651
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.603	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.589	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.657	18	PU2-R-100-3	0.649
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.590	18	PU2-R-100-3	0.576	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.655	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.648
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.588	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.574	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.654	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.647
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.588	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.573	4	PU2-R3	0.648	4	PU2-R3	0.641
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.576	4	PU2-R3	0.564	3	PU2-R2	0.647	2	PU2-R1	0.637
4	PU2-R3	0.572	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.562	2	PU2-R1	0.643	3	PU2-R2	0.636
3	PU2-R2	0.571	2	PU2-R1	0.560	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.643	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.634
2	PU2-R1	0.567	3	PU2-R2	0.559	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.625	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.616
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.559	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.545	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.622	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.611
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.552	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.535	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.615	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.607
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.540	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.524	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.611	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.601
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.538	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.523	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.605	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.595
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.522	16	PU2-G-400-4	0.508	16	PU2-G-400-4	0.588	16	PU2-G-400-4	0.580
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.509	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.494	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.576	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.567

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.489	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.476	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.555	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.548
1	PU2-0	0.358	1	PU2-0	0.313	1	PU2-0	0.461	1	PU2-0	0.424

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

53 Table 21. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-2, Cluster GA-D.

Cluster GA-D

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.850	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.844	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.838	33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.864
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.840	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.834	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.829	32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.855
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.819	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.813	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.813	31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.839
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.803	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.801	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.795	28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.826
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.754	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.754	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.758	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.779
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.751	6	PU2-NS-400	0.747	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.755	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.775
6	PU2-NS-400	0.748	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.740	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.752	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.775
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.745	23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.739	7	PU2-NS-1000	0.744	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.773
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.741	25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.733	6	PU2-NS-400	0.739	6	PU2-NS-400	0.769
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.738	21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.724	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.737	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.763
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.730	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.722	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.736	26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.762
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.723	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.722	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.735	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.758
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.719	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.707	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.734	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.758
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.719	27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.706	29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.733	24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.757
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.717	22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.706	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.733	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.754
5	PU2-NS-100	0.707	5	PU2-NS-100	0.701	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.718	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.741
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.702	20	PU2-R-400-3	0.690	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.717	5	PU2-NS-100	0.740
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.685	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.673	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.715	12	PU2-R-400-4	0.739
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.681	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.669	5	PU2-NS-100	0.713	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.738
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.679	10	PU2-R-400-2	0.668	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.711	8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.736
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.675	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.663	30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.710	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.730
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.670	19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.662	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.703	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.727
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.670	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.660	18	PU2-R-100-3	0.702	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.726
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.669	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.660	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.701	11	PU2-R-100-4	0.726
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.668	18	PU2-R-100-3	0.659	17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.700	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.725
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.665	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.657	15	PU2-G-100-4	0.700	18	PU2-R-100-3	0.724
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.664	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.653	14	PU2-G-100-1	0.700	9	PU2-R-100-2	0.723
4	PU2-R3	0.614	4	PU2-R3	0.609	4	PU2-R3	0.682	4	PU2-R3	0.678
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.600	16	PU2-G-400-4	0.593	3	PU2-R2	0.666	16	PU2-G-400-4	0.658
3	PU2-R2	0.597	2	PU2-R1	0.578	2	PU2-R1	0.651	2	PU2-R1	0.647
2	PU2-R1	0.583	3	PU2-R2	0.577	16	PU2-G-400-4	0.632	3	PU2-R2	0.646

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report


DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.578	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.570	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.610	13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.635
1	PU2-0	0.279	1	PU2-0	0.238	1	PU2-0	0.374	1	PU2-0	0.341

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

54 Figure 21: Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-A by Scenario, PU-2 (Baton Rouge, only)



55

56


57

58

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

59 Figure 22: Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-B by Scenario, PU-2 (Baton Rouge, only)




60

61
62

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

63 Figure 23. Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-C by Scenario, PU-2 (Baton Rouge, only)




64

65
66

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

67 Figure 24. Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-D by Scenario, PU-2 (Baton Rouge, only)



68

69

70

71 Figures 21-24 show the contribution of each metric to utility for each plan, scenario, and cluster.
72 For example, Figure 15 illustrates the contribution of each metric to utility given preferences
73 consistent with the canonical weights of Group GA-A (Cluster A in Section 4.2.1) and the
74 planning assumptions consistent with Scenario 1 (Lower RSLR and High Employment/Dispersed
75 Population). The utility of Plan 31 for a GA-A decision maker given Scenario 1 is 0.835. This
76 result can also be seen in Table 18, which lists utility for Group GA-A and the value of each
77 metric given the scenario. In contrast to the tables, however, these figures show the contribution
78 of progress toward each objective on the overall utility score. The plan may contribute towards
79 the decision objectives, but if the decision maker places relatively little weight on that objective,
80 then the metric will have little impact on overall utility.

81

82 For Clusters A and B, the top ranking plans are Plans 31 and 21. Plans 4, 8 and 22 are the third
83 and fourth ranked plans, depending on scenario. The top ranked plan for these two groups was
84 not sensitive to differences in the assumptions on which the scenarios are based; however, the
85 third- and fourth-ranked plans were sensitive, where Plans 4, 8 and 22 occupied these spots. For
86 Cluster D, the top ranked plans were in descending order: Plans 33, 32, 31 and 28 and were not
87 sensitive to differences in the assumptions on which the scenarios are based. The top-ranked
88 plans for Cluster D were, in descending order, Plans 28, 31 and 32; these also were not sensitive
89 to differences in the assumptions on which the scenarios are based.

90

91 Metrics most contributing to the overall top scores for Groups A and B were spatial integrity (No.
92 4), direct wetland impacts (No. 5), wetlands created/protected (No. 6) and indirect impacts (No.
93 7). For Group D, wetlands created/protected (No. 6) as well as residual damages (No. 1) and
94 resident population impacts (No. 13) are also substantial contributors. Metric contributions for
95 Group C were more balanced overall, with residual damages (No. 1) being the largest contributor
96 (Figure 17).

97

98 Ranking results from all four groups were relatively consistent (Tables 18-21 and Figures 21-24).
99 The top-ranked plan for Groups A and B was Plan 31; it was also the second-ranked plan for
100 Group C and the third-ranked plan for Group D. Plan 32 was the second-ranked plan for Group D
101 and the third-ranked plan for Group C. The rank order for these three groups was only slightly

102 sensitive to differences in the assumptions on which the scenarios are based. This consistency in
 103 ranking results holds regardless of the differences in weighting of metrics across the four systems
 104 of accounts for these groups (see Figures 3 and 4 and Table 5).

105

106 ***4.3.4.1 Identification of Preferred Alternatives – Planning Unit 2***

107

108 Table 22 shows a matrix of preferred alternatives over four possible relative sea level rise and re-
 109 development scenarios. Each cell indicates the preferred alternative given the scenario and the
 110 coastal alternative in parenthesis. For example, for Cluster GA-A, plan PU2-C-R-100-3 (Plan 31)
 111 is insensitive to the rate of relative sea level rise or pattern of development. This table shows that
 112 this pattern also holds for Groups B, C, and D, where Plans 31, 28 and 33 are preferred,
 113 respectively.

114

115 Table 22. Preferred Plan Matrix for Four Clusters.

Cluster GA-A		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU2-C-R-100-3 (PU2-R3)	PU2-C-R-100-3 (PU2-R3)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU2-C-R-100-3 (PU2-R1)	PU2-C-R-100-3 (PU2-R3)	

Cluster GA-B		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU2-C-R-100-3 (PU2-R3)	PU2-C-R-100-3 (PU2-R3)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU2-C-R-100-3 (PU2-R1)	PU2-C-R-100-3 (PU2-R3)	

Cluster GA-C		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU2-C-G-100-4 (PU2-R2)	PU2-C-G-100-4 (PU2-R1)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU2-C-G-100-4 (PU2-R1)	PU2-C-G-100-4 (PU2-R1)	

116

Cluster GA-D	Relative Sea Level Rise	
	Lower	Higher
Pattern of Development		
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU2-C-R-400-3 (PU2-R3)	PU2-C-R-400-3 (PU2-R3)
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU2-C-R-400-3 (PU2-R1)	PU2-C-R-400-3 (PU2-R3)

117

118

119 **4.3.4.2 *Expected Utility – Planning Unit 2***

120

121 Figures 25-28 plot the expected utility of each alternative assuming a uniform distribution of
 122 probability across the two relative sea level rise scenarios ($P(RSLR = \text{Lower}) = 0.5$ and $P(RSLR$
 123 = Higher) = 0.5) for each cluster. These four figures illustrate the expected utility of each
 124 alternative assuming a High Employment and Compact Population scenario. (BAU/Dispersed
 125 was not generated.) These figures illustrate how the utility of some alternatives may be more or
 126 less sensitive to relative sea level rise assumptions than the utility of other alternatives. The error
 127 bands on expected utility represent the minimum and maximum levels of utility over the four
 128 scenarios considered in the LACPR plan. Alternatives with more sensitivity to relative sea level
 129 rise and development assumptions will have wider error bands than those with less sensitivity.
 130 Alternatives that have narrower error bands can be judged to be more predictable in terms of the
 131 level of utility they will provide. For example, Plans 31, 32, and 33 have narrow error bands for
 132 Cluster D (Figure 28). The expected utility of any given alternative and its range of possible
 133 values depends in part upon what set of weights is chosen to calculate utility.

134


135 The calculation of expected utility requires the assignment of probability to each scenario, but in
 136 this case our interest is not in any particular set of probabilities. Rather, our interest is in
 137 understanding how the different alternatives perform under different allocations of probability to
 138 the scenarios. For example, a change in the probabilities might cause expected utility for some
 139 alternatives to increase while causing expected utility for other alternatives to decrease. We are
 140 also interested in the range of expected utility for each scenario. The expected utilities shown in
 141 these figures assume high employment/dispersed populations. Alternatives that have expected

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report


DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

142 utilities with smaller ranges represent more predictable outcomes. These alternatives (for
143 example, Plan 28 in Figure 27) may be preferred to others that have larger ranges (for example,
144 Plan 27 in Figure 27) because these alternatives lead to more predictable outcomes. These figures
145 clearly illustrate that those stakeholders who weight the residual damages metric (No. 1) and the
146 regional economic development metrics (Nos. 11, 12, 13) relatively high have greater sensitivity
147 to relative sea level rise and development assumptions used in modeling decision outcomes.
148

149 Figure 25. Expected Utility of each PU-2 Alternative for Cluster GA-A, showing minimum and
 150 maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).




151
 152 Figure 26. Expected Utility of each PU-2 Alternative for Cluster GA-B, showing minimum and
 153 maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).
 154




155

156 Figure 27. Expected Utility of each PU-2 Alternative for Cluster GA-C, showing minimum and
 157 maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).



158
 159 Figure 28. Expected Utility of each PU-2 Alternative for Cluster GA-D, showing minimum and
 160 maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).



161

162

163 **4.3.4.3 Sensitivity of Decisions to Assumptions about the Probability of**
 164 **Higher Levels of Relative Sea Level Rise – Planning Unit 2**

165

166 Table 23 shows that, for all clusters, the decision is insensitive to the planning assumptions that
 167 have been varied in the scenarios. The plan that maximizes expected utility for stakeholders with
 168 preferences consistent with those of clusters GA-A and GA-B is Plan 31. For stakeholders with
 169 preferences that are consistent with those of GA-C and GA-D, the plan that maximizes expected
 170 utility is Plan 28 and Plan 33, respectively.

171

172 Table 23. Preferred Plan Matrix for Four Clusters.

173

Scenarios 1& 2: High Employment and Dispersed Population											
Cluster	Probability (RSLR = Higher)										
	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
GA-A	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
GA-B	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
GA-C	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28
GA-D	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33

174

175

Scenarios 3 & 4: BAU Employment and Compact Population											
Cluster	Probability (RSLR = Higher)										
	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
GA-A	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
GA-B	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
GA-C	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28
GA-D	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33

176

4.3.5 Ranking of Structural and Nonstructural Plans - Planning Unit 3a

178

MAU scores were calculated for each of the structural and nonstructural plans and the no-action alternative using a full set of fourteen weights and metrics. Only two coastal alternatives are considered in Planning Unit 3b (Plans 2 and 3). A coastal alternative is selected in the first stage of the analysis and is assumed to be an integral part of the structural, nonstructural, and comprehensive plans in the second stage of analysis. In the discussion of PU-3a results that follows, plans are numbered 1-14 as indicated in Table 24 to facilitate discussion.

185

Table 24. Plan Numbers and Plan Names.

187

Plan	Plan Code
1	PU3a-0
2	PU3a-R1
3	PU3a-R2
4	PU3a-NS-100
5	PU3a-NS-400
6	PU3a-NS-1000
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2
11	PU3a-M-100-1
12	PU3a-M-100-2
13	PU3a-G-400-2
14	PU3a-G-1000-2

188

Plans are ranked by MAU for each characteristic stakeholder group in Tables 25-28. In each of the four sub-tables, the first column gives the plan number, the second column gives the plan code, and the third column gives the MAU score. The MAU score provides a measure of the relative value of each alternative and takes a value between zero and one. As described in Section 3.5.1, MAU is the weighted sum of scaled performance metrics, where the weights reflect expressed preferences of one of the four characteristic stakeholder groups identified in Section 4.2.1. Alternatives with higher overall utility are preferred to those with lower utility scores. This type of analysis, in which alternatives are ranked by a deterministic utility score, is replicated for each of the four scenarios representing possible, but uncertain, future conditions that might affect performance.

199

200 More detail on plan rankings is provided in Attachment 4. Tables A4-1 to A4-16 illustrate a
201 “Consumer Reports” type of analysis that ranks the 14 alternatives under consideration in
202 Planning Unit 3a by their overall utility to each characteristic stakeholder group. These tables list
203 the value of each metric associated with the modeled performance of each plan.

204

205 Figures 29-32 show the contribution of each metric to utility for each plan, scenario, and cluster.
206 For example, Figure 29 illustrates the contribution of each metric to utility given preferences
207 consistent with the canonical weights of Group GA-A (Cluster A in Section 4.2.1) and the
208 planning assumptions consistent with Scenario 1 (Lower RSLR and High Employment/Dispersed
209 Population). The utility of Plan 6 for a GA-A decision maker given Scenario 1 is 0.775. This
210 result can also be seen in Table 25, which lists the utility of each plan for Group GA-A. Figure
211 29 shows the contribution of performance outcomes to the overall utility score.

212

213 For clusters GA-A and GA-B, the three top-ranking plans are those that include a combination of
214 coastal and nonstructural measures: Plan 4, Plan 5, Plan 6, and Plan 2 (Figures 29-32). For these
215 sets of preferences, the rank order of these top four plans is constant across the four planning
216 scenarios. Metrics most contributing to the MAU scores for Groups GA-A and GA-B were
217 spatial integrity (No. 4), direct wetland impacts (No. 5), wetlands created/protected (No. 6) and
218 indirect impacts (No. 7). In contrast to the results for clusters GA-A and GA-B, nonstructural
219 plans were not among the highest ranked plans for clusters GA-C and GA-D. Plans 7 and 11 are
220 top-ranked for both clusters GA-C and GA-D across all four scenarios. Lower-order rankings do
221 show some sensitivity to the scenarios and there is a large number of plans with MAU scores that
222 are fairly close to those for the top-ranked plans. The implication of this is that most of these
223 plans would be equally satisfactory for stakeholders who have preferences that are consistent with
224 those of either GA-C or GA-D. However, the MAU scores for GA-C decision makers do tend to
225 be markedly lower overall.

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

226 Table 25. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-3a, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-A

Scenario 1		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.775
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.769
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.751
2	PU3a-R1	0.653
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.618
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.618
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.612
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.607
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.584
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.570
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.557
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.552
1	PU3a-0	0.454
3	PU3a-R2	0.404

Scenario 2		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.773
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.764
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.740
2	PU3a-R1	0.638
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.607
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.603
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.593
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.593
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.581
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.567
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.556
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.550
1	PU3a-0	0.436
3	PU3a-R2	0.340

Scenario 3		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.788
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.783
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.767
2	PU3a-R1	0.687
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.629
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.628
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.622
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.619
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.594
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.582
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.566
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.562
1	PU3a-0	0.489
3	PU3a-R2	0.438

Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.787
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.779
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.758
2	PU3a-R1	0.674
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.618
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.614
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.605
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.604
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.592
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.579
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.567
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.562
1	PU3a-0	0.471
3	PU3a-R2	0.375

227

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

228 Table 26. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-3a, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-B

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.853	6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.856	6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.862	6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.865
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.849	5	PU3a-NS-400	0.851	5	PU3a-NS-400	0.859	5	PU3a-NS-400	0.861
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.838	4	PU3a-NS-100	0.837	4	PU3a-NS-100	0.850	4	PU3a-NS-100	0.850
2	PU3a-R1	0.795	2	PU3a-R1	0.792	2	PU3a-R1	0.816	2	PU3a-R1	0.813
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.613	7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.598	12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.620	7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.604
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.612	11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.596	8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.618	11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.603
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.596	12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.594	7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.603	12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.601
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.594	8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.593	11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.601	8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.600
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.576	9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.578	9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.582	9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.585
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.563	13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.565	13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.570	13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.572
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.538	10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.541	10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.544	10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.548
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.535	14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.538	14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.542	14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.545
3	PU3a-R2	0.483	1	PU3a-0	0.455	3	PU3a-R2	0.503	1	PU3a-0	0.476
1	PU3a-0	0.465	3	PU3a-R2	0.408	1	PU3a-0	0.485	3	PU3a-R2	0.429

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

229 Table 27. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-3a, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-C

Scenario 1		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.580
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.569
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.556
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.553
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.548
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.535
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.534
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.529
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.518
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.515
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.496
1	PU3a-0	0.370
2	PU3a-R1	0.347
3	PU3a-R2	0.263

Scenario 2		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.555
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.545
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.523
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.511
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.509
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.508
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.507
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.504
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.494
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.491
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.453
1	PU3a-0	0.330
2	PU3a-R1	0.307
3	PU3a-R2	0.210

Scenario 3		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.606
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.597
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.582
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.581
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.576
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.566
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.561
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.553
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.547
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.541
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.532
1	PU3a-0	0.447
2	PU3a-R1	0.424
3	PU3a-R2	0.340

Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.582
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.573
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.554
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.539
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.538
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.536
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.535
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.534
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.522
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.519
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.494
1	PU3a-0	0.410
2	PU3a-R1	0.387
3	PU3a-R2	0.290

230

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

231 Table 28. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-3a, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge Session, only).


Cluster GA-D

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.717	7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.701	7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.740	7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.725
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.708	11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.693	11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.733	11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.718
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.706	10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.690	8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.729	6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.714
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.699	6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.683	12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.724	10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.713
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.697	14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.671	6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.722	5	PU3a-NS-400	0.696
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.694	9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.670	10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.716	14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.695
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.683	5	PU3a-NS-400	0.662	5	PU3a-NS-400	0.708	9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.695
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.680	13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.652	9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.707	13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.677
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.676	8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.638	14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.700	8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.662
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.665	12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.632	13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.690	12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.657
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.633	4	PU3a-NS-100	0.608	4	PU3a-NS-100	0.669	4	PU3a-NS-100	0.649
2	PU3a-R1	0.443	2	PU3a-R1	0.410	2	PU3a-R1	0.513	2	PU3a-R1	0.483
1	PU3a-0	0.303	1	PU3a-0	0.267	1	PU3a-0	0.373	1	PU3a-0	0.340
3	PU3a-R2	0.278	3	PU3a-R2	0.208	3	PU3a-R2	0.348	3	PU3a-R2	0.281

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

232

233 Figure 29: Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-A by Scenario for PU-3a (Baton Rouge,
 234 only)




236

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

237 Figure 30: Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-B by Scenario for PU-3a (Baton Rouge,
 238 only)

239




240

241


DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

242
 243 Figure 31. Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-C by Scenario for PU-3a (Baton Rouge,
 244 only)
 245



246

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix




247

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Figure 32. Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-D by Scenario, PU-3a (Baton Rouge, only)



4.3.5.1 Identification of Preferred Alternatives – Planning Unit 3a

Table 29 shows a matrix of preferred alternatives over four possible relative sea level rise and development scenarios. Each cell indicates the preferred alternative given the scenario and the coastal alternative in parentheses. For example, for Clusters GA-A and GA-B, Plan PU3a-NS-1000 (Plan 6) is preferred and this preference does not vary with the planning assumptions of the scenarios. For Groups GA-C and GA-D, Plan PU3a-C-M-100-1 is preferred in all planning scenarios.

Table 29. Preferred Plan Matrix for Four Clusters.

Cluster GA-A		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU3a-NS-1000 (PU3a-R1)	PU3a-NS-1000 (PU3a-R1)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU3a-NS-1000 (PU3a-R1)	PU3a-NS-1000 (PU3a-R1)	

Cluster GA-B		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU3a-NS-1000 (PU3a-R1)	PU3a-NS-1000 (PU3a-R1)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU3a-NS-1000 (PU3a-R1)	PU3a-NS-1000 (PU3a-R1)	

Cluster GA-C		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU3a-C-M-100-1 (PU3a-R2)	PU3a-C-M-100-1 (PU3a-R2)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU3a-C-M-100-1 (PU3a-R2)	PU3a-C-M-100-1 (PU3a-R2)	

11

Cluster GA-D	Relative Sea Level Rise	
	Lower	Higher
Pattern of Development		
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU3a-C-M-100-1 (PU3a-R1)	PU3a-C-M-100-1 (PU3a-R1)
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU3a-C-M-100-1 (PU3a-R1)	PU3a-C-M-100-1 (PU3a-R1)

12

13 **4.3.5.2 *Expected Utility – Planning Unit 3a***

14

15 In a decision analysis with uncertainty, the preferred alternative is the one that maximizes
 16 expected utility. In this analysis, we calculate expected utility for each of the development
 17 scenarios treating RSLR as uncertain. Our ability to address uncertainty in the development
 18 patterns is limited because these scenarios are associated with the extreme values of the regional
 19 economy metrics. This reduced set of development scenarios was necessitated by logistical and
 20 resource constraints.

21

22 Figures 33-36 plot the expected utility of each alternative for an equal allocation of probability to
 23 each of the two relative sea level rise scenarios ($P(RSLR = \text{Lower}) = 0.5$ and $P(RSLR = \text{Higher})$
 24 = 0.5) for each of the characteristic stakeholder groups. These four figures illustrate the expected
 25 utility of each alternative given a High Employment and Dispersed Population scenario.
 26 (BAU/Compact was not generated.) These figures illustrate how the utility of some alternatives
 27 may be more or less sensitive to relative sea level rise assumptions than the utility of other
 28 alternatives. The error bands on expected utility represent the minimum and maximum levels of
 29 utility over the four scenarios considered in the LACPR plan. Alternatives that are more sensitive
 30 to relative sea level rise and development assumptions will have larger error bands and those
 31 alternatives with narrow error bands yield the most predictable levels of utility. The expected
 32 utility of any given alternative and its range of possible values depends in part upon what set of
 33 weights is chosen.

34

35 The calculation of expected utility requires the assignment of probability to each scenario, but in
 36 this case our interest is not in any particular set of probabilities. Rather, our interest is in

37 understanding how the different alternatives perform under different allocations of probability to
38 the scenarios. For example, a change in the probabilities might cause expected utility for some
39 alternatives to increase while causing expected utility for other alternatives to decrease. We are
40 also interested in the range of expected utility for each scenario. The expected utilities shown in
41 these figures assume high employment/dispersed populations. Alternatives that have expected
42 utilities with smaller ranges represent more predictable outcomes. These figures clearly illustrate
43 that those stakeholders who weight the residual damages metric (No. 1) and the regional
44 economic development metrics (Nos. 11, 12, 13) relatively high have greater sensitivity to
45 relative sea level rise and development assumptions used in modeling decision outcomes.

46

Figure 33: Expected Utility of each PU-3a Alternative for Cluster GA-A, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).



Figure 34: Expected Utility of each PU-3a Alternative for Cluster GA-B, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).




Figure 35: Expected Utility of each PU-3a Alternative for Cluster GA-C, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).





Figure 36: Expected Utility of each PU-3a Alternative for Cluster GA-D, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).



1

2 ***4.3.5.3 Sensitivity of Decisions to Assumptions about the Probability of***
 3 ***Higher Levels of Relative Sea Level Rise – Planning Unit 3a***

4

5 Table 30 shows the sensitivity of the preferred alternative to assumptions about the allocation of
 6 probabilities to relative sea level rise scenarios for each cluster and for each development
 7 scenario. For the four sets of preferences considered in this analysis, the outcome of this analysis
 8 is not affected by the planning assumptions considered here.

9

10 Table 30. Preferred Plan Matrix for PU-3a

Scenarios 1& 2: High Employment and Dispersed Population											
Cluster	Probability (RSLR = Higher)										
	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
GA-A	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
GA-B	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
GA-C	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
GA-D	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

11

12

Scenarios 3 & 4: BAU Employment and Compact Population											
Cluster	Probability (RSLR = Higher)										
	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
GA-A	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
GA-B	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
GA-C	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
GA-D	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

13

14

15

16

17

18 **4.3.6 Ranking of Structural and Nonstructural Plans - Planning Unit 3b**

19

20 MAU scores were calculated for each of the structural and nonstructural plans and the no-action
21 alternative using a full set of fourteen weights and metrics. Only one coastal alternative is
22 considered in this planning unit (Plan 2) and is assumed to be part of any plan implementation. In
23 the discussion of PU-3b results that follows, plans are numbered 1-17 as indicated in Table 31 to
24 facilitate discussion.

25

26 Table 31. Plan Numbers and Plan Names.

Plan	Plan Code
1	PU3b-0
2	PU3b-R1
3	PU3b-NS-100
4	PU3b-NS-400
5	PU3b-NS-1000
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1
12	PU3b-G-100-1
13	PU3b-F-100-1
14	PU3b-F-400-1
15	PU3b-F-1000-1
16	PU3b-RL-100-1
17	PU3b-RL-400-1

27

28 Plans are ranked by MAU for each characteristic stakeholder group in Tables 32-35. In each of
29 the four sub-tables, the first column gives the plan number, the second column gives the plan
30 code, and the third column gives the MAU score. The MAU score provides a measure of the
31 relative value of each alternative and takes a value between zero and one. As described in
32 Section 3.5.1, MAU is the weighted sum of scaled performance metrics, where the weights reflect
33 expressed preferences of one of the four characteristic stakeholder groups identified in Section
34 4.2.1. Alternatives with higher overall utility are preferred to those with lower utility scores.
35 This type of analysis, in which alternatives are ranked by a deterministic utility score, is
36 replicated for each of the four scenarios representing possible, but uncertain, future conditions
37 that might affect performance.

38

39 More detail on plan rankings is provided in Attachment 4. Tables A4-1 to A4-16 illustrate a
40 “Consumer Reports” type of analysis that ranks the 17 alternatives under consideration in
41 Planning Unit 3b by their overall utility to each characteristic stakeholder group. These tables list
42 the value of each metric associated with the modeled performance of each plan.

43

44 Figures 37-40 show the contribution of each metric to utility for each plan, scenario, and cluster.
45 For example, Figure 37 illustrates the contribution of each metric to utility given preferences
46 consistent with the canonical weights of Group GA-A (Cluster A in Section 4.2.1) and the
47 planning assumptions consistent with Scenario 1 (Lower RSLR and High Employment/Dispersed
48 Population). The utility of Plan 16 for a GA-A decision maker given Scenario 1 is 0.812. This
49 result can also be seen in Table 32, which lists utility for Group GA-A. Figure 37 shows the
50 contribution of performance outcomes to the overall utility score. Although a plan may
51 contribute substantially towards one of the decision objectives, if preference weights reflect
52 relatively little emphasis on that objective, the performance with respect to that decision objective
53 will have little impact on overall utility.

54

55 For all clusters, the top-ranking plans include 16 (PU3b-RL-100-1) and 17 (PU3b-RL-400-1)
56 (Figures 7-10), suggesting that these plans would be preferred by stakeholders with these four
57 preference patterns. This result holds for all four scenarios. In other words, the preference for
58 these two plans, which are both associated with ring levees in PU-3b, is robust against the
59 uncertainties that have been evaluated as part of this analysis. The significance of this can be
60 seen in Figures 30 – 33, which shows the contribution of each metric to utility scores. These two
61 top-ranked plans satisfy different types of stakeholders for different reasons.

62

63 For clusters GA-A and GA-B, a second tier of plans includes Plans 10 (PU3b-C-RL-100-1), 5
64 (PU3b-NS-1000), and 4 (PU3b-NS-400). Plan 10 is a comprehensive plan with a 100-year ring
65 levee and Plans 4 and 5 are 400-year and 1000-year nonstructural alternatives, respectively.
66 These three plans rank less-highly for clusters GA-C and GA-D.

67

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

68 Table 32. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-3b, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-A

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.812	16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.839	16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.814	16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.841
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.770	17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.805	17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.772	17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.808
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.763	10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.785	10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.765	10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.788
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.746	5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.773	5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.749	5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.776
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.743	7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.771	4	PU3b-NS-400	0.747	7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.775
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.742	4	PU3b-NS-400	0.769	7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.746	4	PU3b-NS-400	0.773
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.735	13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.764	13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.738	13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.768
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.725	11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.758	3	PU3b-NS-100	0.728	11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.760
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.724	3	PU3b-NS-100	0.740	11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.727	3	PU3b-NS-100	0.744
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.678	8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.711	8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.681	8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.714
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.668	14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.701	14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.672	14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.705
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.651	6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.684	6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.653	6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.686
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.649	15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.684	15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.650	15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.686
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.647	12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.680	12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.649	12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.682
2	PU3b-R1	0.627	2	PU3b-R1	0.637	2	PU3b-R1	0.625	2	PU3b-R1	0.637
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.600	9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.633	9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.603	9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.636
1	PU3b-0	0.431	1	PU3b-0	0.404	1	PU3b-0	0.431	1	PU3b-0	0.405

69

70

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

71 Table 33. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-3b, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-B

Scenario 1		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.840
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.808
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.800
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.773
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.770
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.770
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.767
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.764
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.762
2	PU3b-R1	0.717
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.704
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.700
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.662
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.633
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.622
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.620
1	PU3b-0	0.419

Scenario 2		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.886
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.853
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.851
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.822
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.820
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.816
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.816
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.813
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.804
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.757
2	PU3b-R1	0.756
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.752
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.716
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.686
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.675
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.673
1	PU3b-0	0.402

Scenario 3		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.842
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.810
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.802
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.775
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.773
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.772
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.770
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.766
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.766
2	PU3b-R1	0.719
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.706
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.702
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.664
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.635
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.624
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.622
1	PU3b-0	0.421

Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.888
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.856
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.854
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.824
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.823
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.820
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.819
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.816
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.807
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.759
2	PU3b-R1	0.758
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.755
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.718
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.688
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.677
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.675
1	PU3b-0	0.405

72

73

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

74 Table 34. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-3b, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-C

Scenario 1		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.791
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.751
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.731
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.724
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.719
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.702
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.694
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.687
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.684
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.677
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.664
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.659
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.639
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.636
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.585
2	PU3b-R1	0.406
1	PU3b-0	0.378

Scenario 2		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.784
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.752
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.731
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.719
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.718
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.697
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.697
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.679
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.669
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.667
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.663
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.655
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.635
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.604
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.584
2	PU3b-R1	0.361
1	PU3b-0	0.326

Scenario 3		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.798
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.759
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.738
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.733
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.726
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.713
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.699
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.695
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.693
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.687
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.673
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.665
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.650
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.647
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.594
2	PU3b-R1	0.412
1	PU3b-0	0.389

Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.793
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.761
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.738
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.729
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.727
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.710
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.704
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.688
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.680
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.678
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.672
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.663
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.648
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.615
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.593
2	PU3b-R1	0.372
1	PU3b-0	0.339

75

76

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

77 Table 35. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-3b, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-D

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.824	17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.839	16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.830	17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.846
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.817	16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.826	17	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.824	16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.834
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.802	15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.826	15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.807	15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.831
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.767	8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.779	7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.776	8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.787
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.760	7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.776	8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.767	7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.786
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.752	13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.761	13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.761	13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.772
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.742	6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.759	14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.750	14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.769
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.740	14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.758	6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.748	6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.765
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.733	12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.750	12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.739	12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.757
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.724	11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.741	11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.731	11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.749
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.721	9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.722	10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.729	9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.730
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.703	10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.714	9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.711	10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.724
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.677	5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.676	5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.686	5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.686
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.663	4	PU3b-NS-400	0.660	4	PU3b-NS-400	0.674	4	PU3b-NS-400	0.671
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.627	3	PU3b-NS-100	0.606	3	PU3b-NS-100	0.638	3	PU3b-NS-100	0.618
2	PU3b-R1	0.447	2	PU3b-R1	0.415	2	PU3b-R1	0.451	2	PU3b-R1	0.422
1	PU3b-0	0.308	1	PU3b-0	0.249	1	PU3b-0	0.316	1	PU3b-0	0.259


78

79

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

80 Figure 37: Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-A by Scenario for PU-3b (Baton Rouge,
81 only)



82

83
84


DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

85

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

86 Figure 38: Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-B by Scenario for PU-3b (Baton Rouge,
87 only)



88

89
90


DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

91

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix


92 Figure 39. Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-C by Scenario for PU-3b (Baton Rouge,
93 only)



DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Figure 40. Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-D by Scenario, PU-3b (Baton Rouge, only)



4.3.6.1 Identification of Preferred Alternatives – Planning Unit 3b

Table 36 shows a matrix of preferred alternatives over four possible relative sea level rise and development scenarios. Each cell indicates the preferred alternative given the scenario and the coastal alternative in parentheses. For example, for Cluster GA-A, plan PU1-NS-400 (Plan 6) is preferred regardless of relative rate of relative sea level rise under the High Employment growth rate scenario. This table shows that, for Group D, the preference for plan PU1-NS-1000 (Plan 7) is insensitive to the assumptions made about either relative sea level rise or the employment growth rate. However, the decision is sensitive to scenario assumptions for Groups B and C. For Group B, if a BAU employment growth rate is assumed, the preferred alternative depends upon relative sea level rise, with plan PU1-NS-1000 (Plan 7) preferred under Higher relative sea level rise assumptions while plan PU1-NS-100 (Plan 5) is preferred under Lower relative sea level rise assumptions. For Group C, the preferred alternative depends upon the employment growth rate, with plan PU1-NS-1000 (Plan 7) preferred if a High Employment growth rate and a Dispersed Population is assumed while plan PU1-NS-400 (Plan 6) is preferred if a Business as Usual Employment growth rate and Compact Population are assumed.

Table 36. Preferred Plan Matrix for Four Clusters.

Cluster GA-A		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	

Cluster GA-B		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	

19

Cluster GA-C	Relative Sea Level Rise	
	Lower	Higher
Pattern of Development		
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)

Cluster GA-D	Relative Sea Level Rise	
	Lower	Higher
Pattern of Development		
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	PU3b-RL-400-1 (PU3b-R1)
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU3b-RL-100-1 (PU3b-R1)	PU3b-RL-400-1 (PU3b-R1)

20

21

22 **4.3.6.2 *Expected Utility – Planning Unit 3b***

23

24 In a decision analysis with uncertainty, the preferred alternative is the one that maximizes
 25 expected utility. In this analysis, we calculate expected utility for each of the development
 26 scenarios treating RSLR as uncertain. Our ability to address uncertainty in the development
 27 patterns is limited because these scenarios are associated with the extreme values of the regional
 28 economy metrics. This reduced set of development scenarios was necessitated by logistical and
 29 resource constraints.

30

31 Figures 41-44 plot the expected utility of each alternative given an allocation of probability to
 32 each of the two relative sea level rise scenarios ($P(RSLR = \text{Lower}) = 0.5$ and $P(RSLR = \text{Higher})$
 33 = 0.5) for each the characteristic stakeholder groups. These four figures illustrate the expected
 34 utility of each alternative given a High Employment and Dispersed Population scenario.
 35 (BAU/Compact was not generated.) These figures illustrate how the utility of some alternatives
 36 may be more or less sensitive to relative sea level rise assumptions than the utility of other
 37 alternatives. The error bands on expected utility represent the minimum and maximum levels of

38 utility over the four scenarios considered in the LACPR plan. Alternatives that are more sensitive
39 to relative sea level rise and development assumptions will have larger error bands and those
40 alternatives with narrow error bands yield the most predictable levels of utility. The expected
41 utility of any given alternative and its range of possible values depends in part upon what set of
42 weights is chosen.

43

44 The calculation of expected utility requires the assignment of probability to each scenario, but in
45 this case our interest is not in any particular set of probabilities. Rather, our interest is in
46 understanding how the different alternatives perform under different allocations of probability to
47 the scenarios. For example, a change in the probabilities might cause expected utility for some
48 alternatives to increase while causing expected utility for other alternatives to decrease. We are
49 also interested in the range of expected utility for each scenario. The expected utilities shown in
50 these figures assume high employment/dispersed populations. Alternatives that have expected
51 utilities with smaller ranges represent more predictable outcomes.

Figure 41: Expected Utility of each PU-3b Alternative for Cluster GA-A, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).




Figure 42: Expected Utility of each PU-3b Alternative for Cluster GA-B, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).




Figure 43: Expected Utility of each PU-3b Alternative for Cluster GA-C, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).





Figure 44: Expected Utility of each PU-3b Alternative for Cluster GA-D, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).



1

2 ***4.3.6.3 Sensitivity of Decisions to Assumptions about the Probability of***
 3 ***Higher Levels of Relative Sea Level Rise – Planning Unit 3b***

4

5 Table 37 shows the sensitivity of the preferred alternative to assumptions about the allocation of
 6 probabilities to relative sea level rise scenarios for each cluster and for each development
 7 scenario. For the High Employment and Dispersed Population scenario (Scenarios 1 & 2), the
 8 decision is insensitive for all stakeholder groups. Under Scenarios 3 and 4, the preferred
 9 alternative for clusters GA-A and GA-B switches between $P(RSLR = \text{Lower}) = 0.4$ and $P(RSLR$
 10 $= \text{Higher}) = 0.5$. A decision maker who has preferences that are consistent with those of either
 11 Cluster GA-A or GA-B and who believes that $P(RSLR = \text{Lower}) < 0.4$ would prefer
 12 Alternative 5. This illustrates an important point. Although a decision maker may not have
 13 precise knowledge about the probabilities associated with the scenarios, it is still possible to
 14 inform a decision by thinking in less precise terms.

15

16 Table 37. Preferred Plan Matrix for PU-3b

Scenarios 1& 2: High Employment and Dispersed Population											
Cluster	Probability (RSLR = Higher)										
	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
GA-A	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
GA-B	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
GA-C	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
GA-D	16	16	16	16	17	17	17	17	17	17	17

17

Scenarios 3 & 4: BAU Employment and Compact Population											
Cluster	Probability (RSLR = Higher)										
	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
GA-A	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
GA-B	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
GA-C	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
GA-D	16	16	16	16	17	17	17	17	17	17	17

18

19

20

21

22

23 **4.3.7 Ranking of Structural and Nonstructural Plans - Planning Unit 4**

24

25 MAU scores were calculated for each of the structural and nonstructural plans and the no-action
26 alternative using a full set of fourteen weights and metrics. Only one coastal alternative is
27 considered in Planning Unit 4 and is assumed to be an integral part of all other plans. In the
28 discussion of PU-4 results that follows, plans are numbered 1-19 as indicated in Table 38 to
29 facilitate discussion.

30

31 Table 38. Plan Numbers and Plan Names.

Plan	Plan Code
1	PU4-0
2	PU4-R1
3	PU4-NS-100
4	PU4-NS-400
5	PU4-NS-1000
6	PU4-C-G-100-1
7	PU4-C-G-100-2
8	PU4-C-G-400-3
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1
13	PU4-G-100-1
14	PU4-G-100-2
15	PU4-G-400-3
16	PU4-G-1000-3
17	PU4-RL-100-1
18	PU4-RL-400-1
19	PU4-RL-1000-1

32

33 Plans are ranked by MAU for each characteristic stakeholder group in Tables 39-42. In each of
34 the four sub-tables, the first column gives the plan number, the second column gives the plan
35 code, and the third column gives the MAU score. The MAU score provides a measure of the
36 relative value of each alternative and takes a value between zero and one. As described in
37 Section 3.5.1, MAU is the weighted sum of scaled performance metrics, where the weights reflect
38 expressed preferences of one of the four characteristic stakeholder groups identified in Section
39 4.2.1. Alternatives with higher overall utility are preferred to those with lower utility scores.
40 This type of analysis, in which alternatives are ranked by a deterministic utility score, is
41 replicated for each of the four scenarios representing possible, but uncertain, future conditions

42 that might affect performance. More detail on plan rankings is provided in Attachment 4. Tables
43 A4-1 to A4-16 illustrate a “Consumer Reports” type of analysis that ranks the 19 alternatives
44 under consideration in Planning Unit 4 by their overall utility to each characteristic stakeholder
45 group. These tables list the value of each metric associated with the modeled performance of
46 each plan.

47

48 Figures 45-48 show the contribution of each metric to utility for each plan, scenario, and cluster.
49 For example, Figures 45 illustrates the contribution of each metric to utility given preferences
50 consistent with those of Group GA-A (Cluster A in Section 4.2.1) and the planning assumptions
51 of Scenario 1 (Lower RSLR and High Employment/Dispersed Population). The utility of Plan 5
52 (PU4-NS-1000) for a stakeholder with GA-A preferences given the planning assumptions of
53 Scenario 1 is 0.799. This result can also be seen in Table 39, which lists the MAU score for
54 Group GA-A. Figure 45 shows the contribution of performance outcomes to the overall utility
55 score. Although a plan may contribute substantially towards one of the decision objectives, if
56 preference weights reflect relatively little emphasis on that objective, the performance with
57 respect to that decision objective will have little impact on overall utility.

58

59 For all clusters under all planning assumptions, nonstructural alternatives (Plan 5 (PU4-NS-1000)
60 and Plan 4 (PU4-NS-400)) form the top-tier of plans, although Cluster GA-C’s top tier includes
61 other plans as well (e.g., Plan 11 (PU4-C-RL-100-1) and Plan 12 (PU4-C-RL-1000-1)). The
62 nonstructural plans appear to be preferred given the interests of different stakeholder groups, but
63 these plans are preferred by different groups for different reasons. However, stakeholders who
64 have preferences that are consistent with that of Cluster GA-C tend to derive less utility overall
65 than do stakeholders with other types of preferences.

66

67

68

69

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

70 Table 39. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-4, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-A

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.799	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.791	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.807	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.802
4	PU4-NS-400	0.798	4	PU4-NS-400	0.787	4	PU4-NS-400	0.807	4	PU4-NS-400	0.799
3	PU4-NS-100	0.783	3	PU4-NS-100	0.760	3	PU4-NS-100	0.792	3	PU4-NS-100	0.773
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.742	11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.724	11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.749	11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.736
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.736	12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.721	10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.703	12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.741
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.734	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.662	2	PU4-R1	0.688	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.664
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.690	2	PU4-R1	0.650	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.687	2	PU4-R1	0.660
2	PU4-R1	0.686	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.630	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.647	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.628
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.654	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.621	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.638	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.620
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.645	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.533	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.564	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.544
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.558	6	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.530	6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.559	6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.540
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.552	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.529	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.548	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.540
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.541	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.514	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.537	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.524
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.531	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.479	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.494	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.476
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.501	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.478	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.491	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.475
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.499	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.436	1	PU4-0	0.474	1	PU4-0	0.449
1	PU4-0	0.468	1	PU4-0	0.436	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.452	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.434
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.459	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.409	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.424	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.405

71

72

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

73 Table 40. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-4, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-B

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.874	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.868	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.881	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.877
4	PU4-NS-400	0.873	4	PU4-NS-400	0.865	4	PU4-NS-400	0.880	4	PU4-NS-400	0.874
3	PU4-NS-100	0.865	3	PU4-NS-100	0.853	3	PU4-NS-100	0.872	3	PU4-NS-100	0.862
2	PU4-R1	0.818	2	PU4-R1	0.798	2	PU4-R1	0.823	2	PU4-R1	0.807
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.783	11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.773	11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.790	11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.782
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.781	12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.772	10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.763	12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.787
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.780	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.753	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.767	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.755
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.768	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.735	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.741	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.731
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.748	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.730	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.736	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.726
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.743	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.551	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.569	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.559
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.564	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.529	6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.544	6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.535
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.541	6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.527	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.536	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.526
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.539	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.516	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.529	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.523
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.523	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.507	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.520	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.512
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.518	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.505	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.512	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.504
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.515	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.472	1	PU4-0	0.480	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.469
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.483	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.456	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.478	1	PU4-0	0.466
1	PU4-0	0.474	1	PU4-0	0.456	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.460	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.450
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.470									

74

75

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

76 Table 41. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-4, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-C

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.674	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.660	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.692	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.682
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.672	4	PU4-NS-400	0.648	11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.689	4	PU4-NS-400	0.673
4	PU4-NS-400	0.671	12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.643	4	PU4-NS-400	0.689	12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.668
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.670	11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.637	12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.688	11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.663
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.646	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.603	10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.665	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.626
3	PU4-NS-100	0.636	3	PU4-NS-100	0.592	3	PU4-NS-100	0.656	3	PU4-NS-100	0.619
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.625	10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.586	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.642	10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.615
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.604	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.570	6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.622	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.593
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.602	6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.562	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.618	6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.588
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.590	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.544	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.606	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.568
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.531	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.483	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.529	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.490
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.474	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.434	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.463	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.432
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.456	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.409	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.449	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.412
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.451	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.409	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.441	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.407
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.451	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.403	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.443	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.406
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.433	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.390	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.423	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.389
2	PU4-R1	0.404	2	PU4-R1	0.331	1	PU4-0	0.417	1	PU4-0	0.365
1	PU4-0	0.397	1	PU4-0	0.331	2	PU4-R1	0.417	2	PU4-R1	0.359
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.373	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.323	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.359	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.320

77

78

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

79 Table 42. Plans Ranked by Multi-attribute Utility Score for PU-4, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge Session, only).

Cluster GA-D

Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
Plan	Plan Code	Utility									
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.731	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.715	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.754	5	PU4-NS-1000	0.742
4	PU4-NS-400	0.719	4	PU4-NS-400	0.697	4	PU4-NS-400	0.742	4	PU4-NS-400	0.726
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.690	12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.663	12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.711	12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.692
3	PU4-NS-100	0.685	11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.649	3	PU4-NS-100	0.708	11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.679
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.682	3	PU4-NS-100	0.645	10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.674	3	PU4-NS-100	0.675
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.653	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.608	6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.648	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.633
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.629	10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.585	9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.647	6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.618
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.628	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.565	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.613	10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.617
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.595	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.537	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.596	8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.590
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.580	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.524	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.578	7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.563
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.578	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.501	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.520	17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.529
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.536	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.481	2	PU4-R1	0.512	13	PU4-G-100-1	0.493
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.524	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.478	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.506	18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.473
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.521	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.441	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.503	19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.470
2	PU4-R1	0.498	2	PU4-R1	0.431	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.463	2	PU4-R1	0.459
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.478	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.427	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.449	14	PU4-G-100-2	0.434
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.464	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.373	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.390	15	PU4-G-400-3	0.420
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.417	1	PU4-0	0.268	1	PU4-0	0.351	16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.357
1	PU4-0	0.331							1	PU4-0	0.303


80

81

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

82 Figure 45: Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-A by Scenario for PU-4 (Baton Rouge,
83 only)



84

85
86


DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

87

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

88 Figure 46: Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-B by Scenario for PU-4 (Baton Rouge,
89 only)



90

91
92


DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

93

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report


DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Figure 47. Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-C by Scenario for PU-4 (Baton Rouge, only)



DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Figure 48. Contributions of Each Metric to the Multi-attribute Utility Score for Cluster GA-D by Scenario, PU-4 (Baton Rouge, only)



4.3.7.1 Identification of Preferred Alternatives – Planning Unit 4

Table 43 shows a matrix of preferred alternatives over four possible relative sea level rise and development scenarios. For all clusters and all scenarios, plan PU4-NS-1000 (Plan 5) is preferred.

Table 43. Preferred Plan Matrix for Four Clusters.

Cluster GA-A		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	

Cluster GA-B		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	

8

Cluster GA-C		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	

Cluster GA-D		Relative Sea Level Rise	
Pattern of Development	Lower	Higher	
High Employment / Dispersed Population	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	
BAU Employment / Compact Population	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	PU4-NS-1000 (PU4-R1)	

9


10 **4.3.7.2 *Expected Utility – Planning Unit 4***

11


12 In a decision analysis with uncertainty, the preferred alternative is the one that maximizes
13 expected utility. Figures 49-50 plot the expected utility of each alternative given an allocation of
14 probability to each of the two relative sea level rise scenarios ($P(RSLR = \text{Lower}) = 0.5$ and
15 $P(RSLR = \text{Higher}) = 0.5$) for each the characteristic stakeholder groups. These four figures
16 illustrate the expected utility of each alternative given a High Employment and Dispersed
17 Population scenario. (BAU/Compact was not generated.) These figures illustrate how the utility
18 of some alternatives may be more or less sensitive to relative sea level rise assumptions than the
19 utility of other alternatives. The error bands on expected utility represent the minimum and
20 maximum levels of utility over the four scenarios considered in the LACPR plan. Alternatives
21 that are more sensitive to relative sea level rise and development assumptions will have larger
22 error bands and those alternatives with narrow error bands yield the most predictable levels of
23 utility.

24

25 Figure 49: Expected Utility of each PU-4 Alternative for Cluster GA-A, showing minimum and
 26 maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).



27
 28 Figure 50: Expected Utility of each PU-4 Alternative for Cluster GA-B, showing minimum and
 29 maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).



30

Figure 51: Expected Utility of each PU-4 Alternative for Cluster GA-C, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).





Figure 52: Expected Utility of each PU-4 Alternative for Cluster GA-D, showing minimum and maximum utility scores. (Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment/ Dispersed Population).



1

2 ***4.3.7.3 Sensitivity of Decisions to Assumptions about the Probability of***
 3 ***Higher Levels of Relative Sea Level Rise – Planning Unit 4***

4

5 Table 44 shows that the decision is not sensitive to either the preference patterns or the
 6 uncertainties considered in this analysis.

7

8 Table 44. Preferred Plan Matrix for PU-4

Scenarios 1 & 2: High Employment and Dispersed Population											
Cluster	Probability (RSLR = Higher)										
	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
GA-A	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
GA-B	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
GA-C	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
GA-D	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

9

Scenarios 3 & 4: BAU Employment and Compact Population											
Cluster	Probability (RSLR = Higher)										
	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
GA-A	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
GA-B	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
GA-C	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
GA-D	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

10

11

12

13

14 **5. DISCUSSION**

15

16 This application of RIDF has focused on developing an objectives hierarchy for LACPR
17 investigation selection, identifying a set of metrics to model performance outcomes, and
18 developing a multiattribute utility function to rate the relative performance of project alternatives.
19 In the analysis of results, LACPR plan alternatives are ranked by MAU score using four different
20 sets of attribute weights. Each set of weights characterizes a pattern of preference that is
21 represented by a group of individuals, or cluster, within the stakeholder community. Plans are
22 ranked by MAU score and, in the absence of uncertainty in the assumptions used to model plan
23 outcomes, the preferred plan for each cluster is the plan with the highest MAU score. However,
24 most decisions with long-range planning horizons involve a considerable amount of uncertainty
25 and LACPR is no exception. Therefore, the LACPR team has expended considerable effort to
26 evaluate the sensitivity of recommendations to uncertainty in the parameters or assumptions of
27 models used to simulate performance outcomes.

28

29 Uncertain parameters and assumptions of interest to LACPR include the rates of relative sea level
30 rise, the employment growth rate, and the population distribution. Decisions under uncertainty
31 should maximize expected utility, but this requires a set of probability distributions for the
32 uncertain variables that can be used to calculate probabilities for a coherent set of planning
33 scenarios. At this point in the planning process, we have neither a coherent set of scenarios nor a
34 set of probability distributions. Therefore, this analysis assesses the sensitivity analysis over a
35 limited scenario set to assess the robustness of decision alternatives. Robust decision alternatives
36 are those that have consistently high MAU scores across the planning scenarios.

37

38 In addition to augmenting the USACE's six-step P&G guidelines with MCDA and uncertainty,
39 RIDF also provides mechanisms to engage stakeholders more actively in the USACE' planning
40 process. For example, MCDA helps decision makers and stakeholders: 1) systematically
41 structure the decision process; 2) assess tradeoffs among decision objectives; 3) reflect upon,
42 articulate, and apply explicit value judgments concerning conflicting decision criteria; 4) make
43 more consistent and rational evaluations of risks and uncertainties; and 5) facilitate negotiation

44 (Hobbs and Meier 2000). In addition to improving the quality of decisions, RIDF helps decision
45 makers engage stakeholders. Stakeholders assist decision makers to develop an objectives
46 hierarchy and to assess the relative importance of those decision objectives. An obvious benefit
47 of engaging stakeholders during the planning process is that this is likely to engender greater
48 trust and confidence on the part of stakeholders and may enhance the sense of legitimacy of the
49 decision or final outcome. The objectives hierarchy is described in Section 3.1.3 and the
50 stakeholder weight elicitation sessions are described in Section 4.1.

51


52 Results of the stakeholder weight elicitation sessions are analyzed using cluster analysis to reduce
53 the weight elicitation results by identifying characteristic patterns of preference in the stakeholder
54 population. The rationale for this method is that it provides an objective approach to classifying
55 stakeholders based on psychometric data obtained directly from them. With reference to the
56 Baton Rouge subset of respondents representing government agency stakeholders, most clusters
57 place a high weight on environmental decision attributes. Even Cluster GA-C, which ranks NED
58 performance outcomes first, ranks EQ performance outcomes second ahead of RED and OSE
59 performance outcomes. The importance of environmental decision attributes is also apparent
60 when considering the full set of stakeholder weight elicitation results as well. Six clusters weight
61 EQ performance attributes ahead of NED, RED, and OSE performance outcomes. Only one of
62 eight clusters emphasizes RED objectives. This result seems contrary to what might be expected
63 from a group of stakeholders who are local to the region. Only one of eight clusters emphasizes
64 NED objectives.

65

66 Psychometric studies to evaluate preferences are widely recognized as difficult, in part because
67 they are susceptible to biases that can be introduced by investigators and by the format of
68 assessment tools. For example, some studies have shown that level of detail in the objectives
69 hierarchy can sometimes bias weight elicitation results (Weber *et al.* 1988). In a multiattribute
70 objectives hierarchy, the level of detail corresponds with a larger number of decision attributes
71 and metrics. Since there were fourteen metrics used to describe progress on four super objectives
72 (NED, RED, EQ, and OSE), we considered whether or not the higher weight on EQ objectives
73 might be attributed to the use of a larger number of metrics for EQ objectives than other
74 objectives. The other three super objectives were captured by no more than three metrics. Figure
75 53 compares results of the direct weight allocation to the fourteen metrics (aggregated) with the

76 results of direct weight allocation to the four super-objectives representing the four systems of
77 accounts (single objective). In this figure, the y-axis is the sum of the weights allocated under
78 each super objective over all 115 respondents. This figure suggests that the use of greater detail
79 for the EQ objective did not severely distort the pattern of weight allocation in this study,
80 although there is some re-distribution of weights between RED and EQ objectives.

81



82

83 Figure 53. Comparing the Sum of Elicited Weights for Aggregated and Single Objective Direct
84 Weight Allocations

85

86 This study has placed some effort on understanding why the outcomes associated with some
87 alternatives are preferred to others. Utility provides a relative measure with which to compare
88 decision outcomes given a set of objectives and the preferences of a subject. The contribution of
89 an attribute to utility is determined by the relative importance placed on a performance objective
90 and the relative performance of the alternative with respect to that decision objective. If relative
91 performance does not vary much across the alternatives, then it should have little impact on the
92 decision. Similarly, an objective that is unimportant (receives a low weight) should also have
93 little impact on the decision, even if its metric varies a lot from one alternative to another.
94 Decision attributes that do not vary much do not affect the plan rankings. Plan rankings will tend
95 to be more strongly influenced by those decision attributes that have the highest weight and the
96 greatest variability in performance outcomes across plans.

97

98 A feature of this MCDA is the two-stage decision strategy. The coastal plan is selected in the
99 first stage and a structural, nonstructural, or no-action plan is selected in the second stage
100 assuming implementation of the coastal alternative. This strategy reduces the variability and
101 hence the influence of the spatial integrity (No. 4) and wetland created/protected (No. 6) metrics.
102 Although some stakeholders assigned high weights to these objectives these objectives make
103 noticeable contributions to MAU, they contribute very little to differences in MAU among the
104 plans and therefore have almost no influence on plan rankings.

105

106 The results of this analysis can be used to draw conclusions about the project selection decision.
107 For example, in all five planning units, the decision is largely insensitive to the uncertainty in
108 relative sea level rise or to the potential patterns of development considered in this analysis. This
109 result can be observed in Tables 18 and 25. The only sensitivity to rates of relative sea level rise
110 was observed for GA-A and GA-B in PU-1. In this case, changes in relative sea level rise
111 produced changes in the rank ordering of the top three alternatives, but only minor changes in
112 MAU. This suggests that stakeholders would be just as happy with any one of these alternatives
113 despite these uncertainties in assumptions used to model performance outcomes. A similar lack
114 of sensitivity was observed with respect to patterns of development. If the uncertainties in
115 relative sea level rise or the pattern of development have been understated, these results may not
116 hold. There are also other possible development states that exist that have not been considered in
117 this analysis and the insensitivity of the decision to the two states that have been considered
118 should not be viewed as an indication of sensitivity in other possible states. In addition, other
119 uncertainties may exist in the modeling of performance outcomes that are more important than
120 those considered here. If so, these should be considered.

121

122 The level of uncertainty in the metrics used to calculate MAU is difficult to quantify. While
123 considerable effort has gone into estimating the performance outcomes reflected in these metrics,
124 most observers will perceive that there is much uncertainty in these estimates that has not yet
125 been addressed and that a more comprehensive analysis of uncertainty is possible. Therefore,
126 while the LACPR decision strategy emphasizes the ranking of plans by MAU, these results
127 should be interpreted with some caution. For example, rather than attempting to identify “the
128 preferred plan,” a more cautious interpretation of these results would focus on identifying which
129 plans form a top tier of plans with the highest MAU scores in each planning unit. It is also

130 important to understand what are the common elements of these plans and how and why these top
131 tiers differ across preference patterns.

132

133 One of the benefits of subjecting policy decisions such as those being considered in LACPR to a
134 multi-attribute decision analysis and stakeholder involvement is that it helps decision makers to
135 identify where common interests exist and where and how bridges can be built to unite
136 stakeholders who hold competing views. In this case, one or two plans seem to rank highly for all
137 clusters in all planning units. For example, in PU-1, Plans 5 (PU1-NS-100), 6 (PU1-NS-400),
138 and 7 (PU1-NS-1000) form the top tier of plans for all clusters. In PU-2, Plan 31 (PU2-C-R-100-
139 3) is within the top three plans for all clusters. This result implies that these plans each offer a set
140 of outcomes that stakeholders who hold substantially different preference patterns could agree.
141 Therefore, these plans deserve further investigation. However, it is important to note that
142 although a plan may have a high rank over a large number of preference patterns, the utility of
143 that plan for one or more of those preference types may be substantially lower than for others. In
144 this case, consideration should be given to how large these differences in utility are, whether or
145 not these differences represent an inequity, and to what extent this outcome may be the product of
146 having considered only a limited scope of decision alternatives.

147

148 6. PATH FORWARD

149

150 The results described in this report are not final and will be revised through subsequent analysis
151 as the LACPR Technical Team continues to work on improving the decision analysis. An
152 iterative approach to this analysis is justified by the complexity of this decision and the potential
153 costs and consequences of the decision alternatives. This section of the report outlines planned
154 changes and improvements in the analysis that address a number of important issues. These
155 improvements will be implemented as it is appropriate and possible to do so.

156

157 We will modify the objectives hierarchy and revise and refine the metric set to improve
158 communication with stakeholders. A preferred objectives hierarchy would be comprehensive in
159 that objectives and metrics would capture the full spectrum of stakeholder interests that really do
160 matter while being directly and uniquely tied to those interests. This will be accomplished by re-

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

161 visiting the objectives hierarchy and reducing the size of the metric set to eliminate redundancy
162 and by combining metrics wherever possible. For example, we will clarify the definitions of
163 metrics, we will reduce the use of qualitative metric scales where-ever possible, and we will make
164 the economic and cost metrics more meaningful to respondents by expressing costs in terms of a
165 tax burden. Where qualitative scales are used, we will clearly define selected points on those
166 scales in terms that will be specific and meaningful to stakeholders. This new objectives
167 hierarchy and metric set will facilitate improved communication with stakeholders in the next
168 round of stakeholder engagements.

169

170 The LACPR Technical Team will re-engage stakeholders by conducting additional weight
171 elicitation sessions during the winter of 2008. In this round of stakeholder interaction, we will
172 again use several different instruments including swing weighting method and improved versions
173 of the direct weight allocation method and objectives ranking method. The swing weight method
174 is expected to yield a more refined set of preferences that are directly applicable and specific to
175 the project selection decision than direct weight allocation. Swing weighting improves on the
176 direct weight elicitation method by providing information on the potential outcomes of the
177 alternatives. An important tradeoff in implementing the swing method is increased complexity.
178 Although the cognitive task that subjects are asked to complete is more challenging, the method
179 helps the stakeholders refine their preferences by knowing what objectives really do matter for
180 the outcomes.

181

182 The LACPR Technical Team hopes to expand the number and diversity of stakeholders who
183 participate in weight elicitation sessions by holding a greater number of sessions in more places
184 and better advertising the opportunity for stakeholder participation. This expanded effort is
185 important because participants should represent the interests of the entire population on the coast.
186 If participants are drawn from too narrow a subset of the population, the interests of the
187 population will not be accurately represented.

188

189 The LACPR Technical Team will implement better controls during the weight elicitation
190 procedure to qualify our results by implementing internal validity tests. For example, future
191 weight elicitation sessions will include tests to help confirm that subjects understand and are
192 implementing the instructions properly. In addition, persons conducting the weight elicitation

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

193 sessions will follow a script so that the procedure is consistently applied from one implementation
194 to another and is well documented. We will also expand the scope of information collected from
195 stakeholders by conducting an ancillary survey at the time of the weight elicitation session. This
196 survey will present participants with a set of general preference questions that are unrelated to the
197 LACPR project selection decision. Responses to these questions will assist us to develop a more
198 meaningful interpretation of the clusters. This will also provide the ground work for formalizing
199 the MCDA technique and making it more applicable to other USACE decisions.

200

201 Other aspects of this analysis also deserve attention. In particular, the scope of uncertain inputs to
202 the analysis should be re-evaluated to confirm that the inputs selected for the analysis of
203 uncertainty are indeed the most important ones. Presently, the analysis considers only three
204 uncertain inputs (relative sea level rise, employment growth rate, and population dispersion). If
205 necessary, additional inputs should be evaluated and the process for selecting these inputs to the
206 analysis should be documented. The analysis should consider not only the scenarios associated
207 with most extreme outcomes, but also the most probable scenarios. When manipulating these
208 inputs to generate the scenarios, the scenarios should encompass the full range of potential values
209 that might actually be realized during the planning horizon. A joint probability distribution for
210 the scenarios can then be derived for the scenarios and the decision can be framed to maximize
211 expected utility. Since probability distributions for uncertain inputs to the analysis are not well
212 known, a sensitivity analysis should be conducted varying the parameters of the input probability
213 distributions.

214

215 The LACPR Technical Team expects to revise the RIDF incorporating these improvements in the
216 next iteration of the planning process. This may result in substantial changes to the results
217 presented in this report. For example, new preference patterns may emerge and existing
218 preference patterns may be revised. Plan rankings will also be revised to reflect the various
219 changes and improvements in methods. New results will be compiled and presented in final
220 report to Congress. We will also develop a risk and reliability analysis of the selected plan to
221 identify vulnerabilities.

222 7. CITATIONS

- 224 Clemen, R. T. 1995, *Making Hard Decisions: An Introduction to Decision Analysis*.
225 Belmont, Ore., Wadsworth Pub. Co.

226 Dillon, W.R. and M. Goldstein, 1984, *Multivariate Analysis: Methods and Applications*,
227 Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, New York, John Wiley & Sons.

228 Graedel TE, Allenby BR. 2002. Hierarchical metrics for sustainability. *Environ Qual
229 Manag* 12:21–30.

230 Hobbs, B. F., and Meier, P. 2000, *Energy Decisions and the Environment: A Guide to the
231 Use of Multicriteria Methods*: International Series in Operations Research &
232 Management Science, Vol. 28. Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

233 Keeney, R. L., and Raiffa, H. 1976, *Decisions with Multiple Objectives: Preferences and
234 Value Tradeoffs*. New York, Wiley.

235 Kiker, G., Bridges, T., Varghese, A.S., Seager, T.P., and Linkov, I. 2005. Application of
236 multi-criteria decision analysis in environmental management. *Integrated
237 Environmental Assessment and Management* 1 v. 2 49-58.

238 Linkov, I., Varghese, A., Jamil, S., Seager, T.P., Kiker, G., and Bridges, T. 2004. Multi-
239 criteria decision analysis: framework for applications in remedial planning for
240 contaminated sites. In: I. Linkov and A. Ramadan, eds., *Comparative Risk Assessment
241 and Environmental Decision Making*. Kluwer, Amsterdam.

242 Louisiana's Comprehensive Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast. Draft dated February
243 2007. <http://www.louisianacoastalplanning.org/>.

244 Males, R. M., 2002, Beyond Expected Value: Making decisions under risk and uncertainty.
245 RMM Technical Services, under contract to Planning and Management Consultants,
246 Ltd. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources. IWR
247 Report.

248 Morgan, M. G., Henrion, M., and Small, M. 1990, *Uncertainty: A Guide to Dealing with
249 Uncertainty in Quantitative Risk and Policy Analysis*. Cambridge; New York,
250 Cambridge University Press.

251 NRC. 1999. New Directions in Water Resources Planning for the U.S. Army Corps of
252 Engineers. National Academy Press. Washington DC.

253 Roy, B. (1985, English translation 1996). *Multicriteria Methodology for Decision Aiding*.
254 Kluwer, Boston.

255 SAS Institute Inc., 2004, SAS/STAT 9.1 Users Guide, Cary NC: SAS Institute.

256 Seager, T., Satterstrom, K., Linkov, I., Tuler, S., Kay, R. 2007, in press. Typological
257 Review of Environmental Performance Metrics (with Illustrative Examples for Oil Spill
258 Response). *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*.

259 Seager TP, Theis TL. 2004. A taxonomy of metrics for testing the industrial ecology
260 hypotheses and application to design of freezer insulation. *J Cleaner Prod.* 12:865–875.

261 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2003a. Environmental Operating Principles (EOP).
262 (<http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cepa/envprinciples.htm>)

263

- DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix
- 264 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2003b. Planning Civil Works Projects under the
265 Environmental Operating Principles. Circular 1105-2-404.
266 (<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/usace-docs/eng-circulars/ec1105-2-404/entire.pdf>)
267 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2004. Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA), Louisiana Ecosystem
268 Restoration Study. Final Report, Volume 1: LCA Study – Main Report. November.
269 http://www.lca.gov/main_report.aspx.
270 Weber, M., F. Eisenfuhr, and D. von Winterfeldt, 1988, The effects of splitting attributes on
271 weights in multiattribute utility measurement. Management Science 34(4): 431-445.
272 Working Group for Post-Hurricane Planning for the Louisiana Coast (Working Group).
273 2006. A New Framework for Planning the Future of Coastal Louisiana after the
274 Hurricanes of 2005. January 26, 2006. [online] <http://www.umces.edu/la-restore/>
275 Yoe C.E. and Orth, K. D. 1996. Planning Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Water
276 Resources Support Center, Institute for Water Resources. IWR Report 96-R-21.
277 November 1996.
278 Yoe, 2002. *Trade-Off Analysis Planning and Procedures Guidebook*. Prepared for
279 Institute for Water Resources, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. April 2002. IWR 02-R-2
280 [online:] <http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/iwr/pdf/tradeoff.pdf>
281
282

Attachment 1 – Stakeholder Workshop Participants

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

3

4 Table A1-1. Federal and State Government Participants 16 October: 22 participants

Name	Organization
Tamieka Armstrong	IAPWS-FWS
Bruce Baird	MMS
Patricia Brown	DOC/NOAA National Weather Service
Charlie Demas	USGS-LA Water Science Center
John Ettinger	USEPA
Bill Feazel	LA DOTD Public Works
Bren Haase	LDNR/CRD
Rick Hartman	NMFS
Quin Kinler	USDA-NRCS
Dawn Lavoie	USGS
Bob Mahoney	FHWA
Troy Mallach	USDA-NRCS
Ronny Paille	USFWS
Rick Rayne	LDNR/CRD
Kirk Rhinehart	LDNR/CRD
Manuel Ruiz	LDWF
Kerry St. Pe	Barataria-Terrebonne National Estuary Program (BTNEP)
Jamie Setze	FHWA
Greg Steyer	USGS
Charlie Tobelman	FEMA
Paul Trotter	DOC/NOAA National Weather Service
Patrick Williams	NOAA/NMFS

5

6 Table A1-2. New Orleans Participants 22 October. 27 participants

Name	Organization
Christopher Andry	St. Bernard Parish Govt.
Dan Arceneaux	St. Bernard Parish Coastal Zone Advisory

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

	Commission
Brady Crouch	ConocoPhillips
Jammie Favorite	LADNR
Wyneta Fisher	City of New Orleans
Alim Hannoura	UNO/Civil Engineering
Albertine Kimble	Plaquemines Parish Government
Shirley Laska	UNO/CHART
Joseph Leblanc	LADNR
John Lopez	Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation
Michael Massimi	BTNEP
Alex McCorquodale	UNO/PIES
James McMenil	LADOTO
Randy Moertle	Biloxi Marsh Lands Corp.-Lake Eugenie Land Development
David Muth	Orleans Audubon Society
Earthea Nance	City of New Orleans
Alaina Owens	CLEAR at LSU
Dietmar Rietschier	Amite River Basin Commission
Blair Ritter	Plaquemines Parish Government
Benny Rouselle	LADNR
Lionel Serpas	Plaquemines Parish Government
Debbie Settoon	Citizens for a Safer Jefferson
Joe Shoemaker	St. Tammany Parish
Natalie Snider	CRCL
Stevan Spencer	Orleans Levee District
Dustin White	LADOTO
Marnie Winter	Jefferson Parish Environmental Dept.

7

8 Table A1-3. Houma Participants 23 October. 24 participants

Name	Organization
Henri Boulet	LA 1 Coalition

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Jim Boulet	Private citizen
Dwayne Bourgeois	North Lafourche Conservation Levee and Drainage District
Barney Callahan	Louisiana Wildlife Federation/Shell Oil Co.
Chet Chiasson	Greater Lafourche Port Commission
Kermit Coulon	ConocoPhillips/Continental Land and Fur Co.
Cindy Cutrera	St. Mary Industrial Group
Thomas Dardan	United Houma Nation
Daniel Dearmond	LADNR
Mark Ford	Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana
Aaron Foret	Lafourche Parish Farm Bureau
Wilson Gaidry	C.S. Gaidry, Inc.
Wes Kungel	Senator Landrieu Office
Lori LeBlanc	Restore or Retreat-Governor's Coastal Commission
Al Levron	Terrebonne Parish
Greg Linscombe	ConocoPhillips/Continental Land and Fur Co.
Simone Maloz	Restore or Retreat-Governor's Coastal Commission
James McMenis	LADOTD
Randy Moertle	Avery Island, Inc.
Jack Moore	Terrebonne Parish School Board
Leslie Suazo	Terrebonne Parish
Cyrus Theriot Jr.	Harry Bourg Corp. Land Owner
Paul Yakupzach	Terrebonne Parish Coastal Zone Committee
Jerome Zeringue	Terrebonne Levee and Conservation District

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

12

Table A1-4. Lake Charles Participants 24 October. 21 participants

Name	Organization
Dewey Billodeau	LADNR/CED
John Coppock	Calcasieu Parish Police Jury
Mike Dever	Providence Engineering
R.A. “Bob” Dewey	Congressman Charles W. Boustany
D.Y. “Billy” Doland	LA Farm Bureau
Carolyn Drosley	CRCL
Glen Harris	USFWS
Courtney Heardod	U.S. Senator Vitter
Tina Horn	Cameron Parish Police Jury
Paul Kemp	National Audubon Soc.
Dam Mattingly	Calcasieu Parish Police Jury
Adam McBride	Port of Lake Charles
Mickey McMillin	Waist Deep Duck LLC landowner
George Melancon	LA Dept of Wildlife and Fisheries
Doug Miller	The North American Land Co./Sweet Lake Land and Oil
Randy Moertle	M.O. Miller estate
David Richard	Stream Companies
Natalie Snyder	CRCL
Dona Weifenbach	DNR/CRD
Maura Wood	Nat. Wildlife Fed.
Bart Yakupzack	Gray Law Firm/Tower Land Company, LLC

13

Table A1-5. Abbeville Participants 25 October. 21 participants

Name	Organization
Rebecca Broussard	Vermillion Parish Office of Homeland Security and EP
Chad Courville	Miami Corporation
Tim Creswell	Vermillion Parish DEP Assoc. Dir. Abbeville

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

	Harbor and Terminal
Bob Dew	Ducks Unlimited, Inc.
Linda Harder	City of Kaplan
Channing Hayden	Port of Lake Charles
Bill Higalgo	St. Mary Industrial Group, Atchafalaya River Coalition
Jewitt Hulin	7 th Ward Gravity Drainage District
Henry Lagrange	Chief Administrative Officer, St. Mary Parish Gov't
Robert LeBlanc	Vermillion Parish DEP
James Levene	Vermillion Cattlemen Assoc.
Donald Menard	Town of Erath
Bill Pecoraro	ARC Morgan City Atchafalaya River Comm.
Darrell Pontiff	LADNR
Louis Rateliff	Mayor, Town of Berinda
Donald Sagrera	Teche Vermillion Fresh Water District
Mike Sagrera	Vermillion Parish Drainage District 2
Sherrill Sagrera	Vermillion Parish Coastal Advisory
Natalie Snyder	CRCL
Timmy Vincent	National Audubon Society
Linda Zaunbrecher	LA Farm Bureau

15

16 Table A1-6. USACE Participants 22 October. 10 participants

Name	Organization
Tim Axtman	MVN
Pam Deloach	MVN
Larry Donovan	MVN Contractor
Judi Gutierrez	MVN
Lisa Leonard	MVN
Brian Maestri	MVN
Sean Mickal	MVN

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Al Naomi	MVN
Vann Stutts	MVN
Lisa Wadsworth	MVN Contractor

- 17 Note: The MVN Technical Team provided weightings on 22 October from 10 am to 12 pm in the
18 UNO Lindy Boggs Bld.

Attachment 2 – Stakeholder Allocations (Agency Data Baton Rouge)

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A2-1. Allocation of 100 Points to 14 Metrics for Government Agencies Participating in the 16 October Baton Rouge Workshop
 (See Tables 3-5 for metric descriptions).

Respondent Code	GA Cluster	Planning Objective and Metric													
		National Economic Objectives			Environmental Objectives						Regional Economic Objectives			Other Social Effects	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
GA77	A	6	6	6	14	15	20	15	2	2	4	4	2	2	2
GA84	A	5	10	10	10	15	25	10	1	1	1	6	3	2	1
GA94	A	1	13	7	6	11	25	10	5	3	6	4	5	3	1
GA78	A	7	7	7	16	16	16	16	2	1	7	1	1	1	2
GA75	A	8	11	7	17	12	16	7	2	2	3	3	3	7	2
GA89	A	5	8	8	5	22	15	16	3	1	2	2	3	8	2
GA88	A	3	6	5	6	24	25	11	1	1	6	6	3	2	1
GA82	B	2	1	1	10	25	30	10	2	1	2	2	2	7	5
GA85	B	3	5	8	17	19	20	21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
GA86	B	1	5	7	5	15	34	26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
GA87	B	2	12	1	11	10	42	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
GA76	B	3	2	2	10	30	20	12	1	1	2	3	3	10	1
GA74	C	11	20	1	1	1	5	5	5	25	5	6	5	5	5
GA81	C	16	13	10	5	13	5	6	1	1	2	9	4	14	1
GA79	C	26	14	6	8	5	5	5	1	1	10	6	6	6	1
GA83	D	5	5	7	7	7	25	5	7	3	5	5	5	9	5
GA92	D	12	3	3	9	9	9	10	4	4	6	6	6	15	4
GA90	D	12	7	5	1	8	12	12	6	1	5	6	7	12	6
GA80	Outlier	31	15	10	8	5	8	8	1	1	5	2	3	2	1
GA91	Outlier	5	20	15	3	6	15	10	2	2	2	2	1	15	2
GA93	Outlier	12	1	1	3	5	5	7	4	5	13	9	14	15	6

Attachment 3 – Stakeholder Allocations (All Data Combined)

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A3-1. Allocation of 100 Points to 14 Metrics for All Stakeholders (See Tables 3-5 for metric descriptions).

Code	Cluster	Elicitation Session	Planning Objective and Metric													
			National Economic Objectives			Environmental Objectives					Regional Economic Objectives			Other Social Effects		
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
AB100	A	Abbeville	15	4	20	4	5	10	5	6	4	5	5	5	6	6
AB101	A	Abbeville	25	5	15	3	6	4	6	1	2	6	9	6	7	5
AB102	A	Abbeville	20	5	15	5	7	7	2	1	1	8	10	10	8	1
GA79	A	Agency	26	14	6	8	5	5	5	1	1	10	6	6	6	1
GA80	A	Agency	31	15	10	8	5	8	8	1	1	5	2	3	2	1
GA81	A	Agency	16	13	10	5	13	5	6	1	1	2	9	4	14	1
H52	A	Houma	20	18	14	8	6	6	5	2	4	5	4	4	2	2
H53	A	Houma	20	18	12	8	6	8	6	2	2	6	4	4	2	2
H63	A	Houma	5	1	40	12	1	25	1	1	1	1	5	5	1	1
LC22	A	Lake Charles	30	10	10	1	1	4	5	5	2	10	7	7	5	3
TT65	A	Tech Team	22	10	10	5	5	5	5	1	1	15	5	10	5	1
TT66	A	Tech Team	20	15	14	1	6	5	1	1	3	8	7	6	12	1
TT69	A	Tech Team	30	10	10	1	5	5	4	1	1	7	5	5	15	1
TT70	A	Tech Team	20	12	13	4	5	8	4	2	1	6	7	5	10	3
TT72	A	Tech Team	15	30	4	6	3	15	3	4	2	6	2	2	6	2
AB105	B	Abbeville	4	3	15	2	5	20	14	3	4	8	3	5	12	2
AB107	B	Abbeville	4	1	15	5	2	20	2	1	1	8	10	5	25	1
AB113	B	Abbeville	7	5	15	4	20	1	8	1	1	9	6	10	12	1
AB114	B	Abbeville	7	2	20	5	1	25	1	1	1	10	4	8	14	1
AB115	B	Abbeville	9	5	10	8	8	6	8	5	10	7	6	7	5	6
AB97	B	Abbeville	9	5	4	6	13	11	8	6	6	3	7	10	6	6
AB99	B	Abbeville	13	2	3	6	5	12	7	10	1	10	8	11	1	11
GA90	B	Agency	12	7	5	1	8	12	12	6	1	5	6	7	12	6
GA92	B	Agency	12	3	3	9	9	9	10	4	4	6	6	6	15	4

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Code	Cluster	Elicitation Session	Planning Objective and Metric													
			National Economic Objectives			Environmental Objectives					Regional Economic Objectives			Other Social Effects		
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
H43	B	Houma	5	8	20	2	3	8	3	4	2	10	10	10	10	5
H54	B	Houma	15	1	5	17	1	10	5	2	2	15	5	5	12	5
H60	B	Houma	10	5	10	5	8	5	8	10	5	10	5	4	10	5
LC35	B	Lake Charles	4	20	3	2	2	20	2	1	1	5	10	4	25	1
LC41	B	Lake Charles	10	3	15	5	10	15	8	1	1	8	7	4	9	4
NO1	B	New Orleans	15	10	8	4	1	4	1	5	5	15	8	8	8	8
NO17	B	New Orleans	3	5	15	12	11	10	2	1	2	13	9	7	4	6
NO2	B	New Orleans	10	5	5	5	10	15	10	3	3	10	5	5	10	4
NO9	B	New Orleans	6	8	8	10	8	15	10	3	1	5	7	6	8	5
TT64	B	Tech Team	17	11	4	4	7	7	7	2	2	5	11	10	11	2
TT67	B	Tech Team	25	5	10	10	5	5	1	1	1	7	7	7	15	1
TT71	B	Tech Team	20	6	6	4	4	6	4	7	1	4	10	10	15	3
AB96	C	Abbeville	5	2	8	5	5	7	5	1	1	15	18	20	7	1
H42	C	Houma	8	7	8	5	2	6	2	2	2	26	6	10	14	2
H44	C	Houma	2	2	18	2	10	8	2	2	2	22	2	12	14	2
LC40	C	Lake Charles	6	5	5	6	6	6	5	2	1	17	15	14	9	3
AB108	D	Abbeville	11	1	15	5	10	15	5	1	1	5	5	5	20	1
GA91	D	Agency	5	20	15	3	6	15	10	2	2	2	2	1	15	2
H45	D	Houma	15	7	12	6	10	20	7	1	2	1	1	2	15	1
H48	D	Houma	15	2	20	10	1	10	1	15	5	1	1	1	15	3
H62	D	Houma	1	1	25	15	30	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	20	1
LC37	D	Lake Charles	20	1	1	3	15	15	1	3	3	3	5	7	20	3
NO15	D	New Orleans	10	0	15	5	5	15	10	5	5	5	5	0	15	5
NO19	D	New Orleans	0	0	25	0	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0
NO20	D	New Orleans	1	1	20	1	25	25	1	1	1	1	1	1	20	1
NO21	D	New Orleans	0	1	20	1	22	26	1	1	1	1	3	1	21	1
TT68	D	Tech Team	10	6	10	8	10	8	8	8	5	3	3	3	10	8

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Code	Cluster	Elicitation Session	Planning Objective and Metric													
			National Economic Objectives			Environmental Objectives					Regional Economic Objectives			Other Social Effects		
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
AB104	E	Abbeville	5	5	8	5	15	30	15	1	1	2	5	2	5	1
AB112	E	Abbeville	10	1	15	5	5	40	5	1	5	5	5	1	1	1
AB95	E	Abbeville	5	2	15	5	20	2	2	2	20	8	10	5	2	2
GA77	E	Agency	6	6	6	14	15	20	15	2	2	4	4	2	2	2
GA78	E	Agency	7	7	7	16	16	16	16	2	1	7	1	1	1	2
GA84	E	Agency	5	10	10	10	15	25	10	1	1	1	6	3	2	1
GA88	E	Agency	3	6	5	6	24	25	11	1	1	6	6	3	2	1
GA94	E	Agency	1	13	7	6	11	25	10	5	3	6	4	5	3	1
LC26	E	Lake Charles	11	1	4	11	13	15	14	2	1	8	7	6	6	1
LC30	E	Lake Charles	15	1	5	10	5	20	25	1	1	5	5	1	5	1
LC33	E	Lake Charles	15	1	12	11	7	20	25	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
LC34	E	Lake Charles	15	1	5	10	7	20	25	1	2	5	4	3	1	1
LC39	E	Lake Charles	1	3	9	20	20	20	1	1	1	15	3	3	2	1
NO13	E	New Orleans	5	1	5	1	20	20	25	1	1	5	5	5	5	1
TT73	E	Tech Team	3	5	5	17	17	19	17	1	1	4	3	4	3	1
AB103	F	Abbeville	9	8	14	2	15	25	2	1	1	2	10	8	2	1
AB111	F	Abbeville	10	1	20	5	5	30	5	1	1	10	5	1	5	1
GA74	F	Agency	11	20	1	1	1	5	5	5	25	5	6	5	5	5
GA75	F	Agency	8	11	7	17	12	16	7	2	2	3	3	3	7	2
GA89	F	Agency	5	8	8	5	22	15	16	3	1	2	2	3	8	2
H46	F	Houma	10	1	20	6	7	30	10	1	1	1	1	1	10	1
H59	F	Houma	13	5	15	5	4	26	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	3
LC23	F	Lake Charles	15	10	7	5	5	7	10	6	4	11	5	5	5	5
LC28	F	Lake Charles	1	1	35	10	5	30	10	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
LC29	F	Lake Charles	12	3	8	9	14	10	15	3	3	7	3	3	5	5
LC32	F	Lake Charles	11	10	14	20	9	15	8	1	1	1	7	1	1	1
LC38	F	Lake Charles	4	3	30	10	8	10	15	2	2	2	5	5	2	2

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Code	Cluster	Elicitation Session	Planning Objective and Metric													
			National Economic Objectives			Environmental Objectives				Regional Economic Objectives			Other Social Effects			
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
NO14	F	New Orleans	2	10	25	7	15	7	4	4	3	11	3	2	3	4
AB109	G	Abbeville	3	10	10	32	3	28	5	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
AB110	G	Abbeville	10	1	6	20	3	24	24	1	1	3	1	1	4	1
GA85	G	Agency	3	5	8	17	19	20	21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
GA86	G	Agency	1	5	7	5	15	34	26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
GA87	G	Agency	2	12	1	11	10	42	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
H55	G	Houma	1	1	19	30	1	40	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
H56	G	Houma	1	1	3	3	21	60	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
H57	G	Houma	10	1	6	20	4	27	21	1	1	2	1	1	4	1
LC24	G	Lake Charles	5	1	1	25	23	15	10	1	10	1	1	5	1	1
LC25	G	Lake Charles	10	5	3	15	10	25	20	1	2	3	1	3	1	1
LC31	G	Lake Charles	10	1	6	20	3	22	26	1	1	3	1	1	4	1
NO10	G	New Orleans	1	1	1	35	25	25	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
NO6	G	New Orleans	2	2	3	20	16	50	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
NO7	G	New Orleans	1	1	1	15	25	35	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
NO8	G	New Orleans	1	1	3	19	15	27	23	1	1	3	1	1	3	1
GA76	H	Agency	3	2	2	10	30	20	12	1	1	2	3	3	10	1
GA82	H	Agency	2	1	1	10	25	30	10	2	1	2	2	2	7	5
GA83	H	Agency	5	5	7	7	7	25	5	7	3	5	5	5	9	5
H47	H	Houma	9	1	6	12	8	24	19	1	1	1	6	1	10	1
H49	H	Houma	3	2	10	5	5	15	30	2	2	5	2	2	15	2
H51	H	Houma	10	1	1	1	25	40	1	1	1	1	5	1	11	1
H58	H	Houma	1	1	1	30	15	22	10	1	1	1	1	5	10	1
NO11	H	New Orleans	5	2	1	12	12	13	12	5	2	6	8	6	10	6
NO12	H	New Orleans	4	5	5	20	10	20	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	5
AB106	Outlier	Abbeville	9	13	18	9	1	8	1	1	8	8	10	12	1	1
AB98	Outlier	Abbeville	2	1	9	7	8	13	6	3	5	9	8	11	14	4

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Code	Cluster	Elicitation Session	Planning Objective and Metric													
			National Economic Objectives			Environmental Objectives				Regional Economic Objectives			Other Social Effects			
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
GA93	Outlier	Agency	12	1	1	3	5	5	7	4	5	13	9	14	15	6
H50	Outlier	Houma	8	5	7	1	8	10	5	3	5	15	12	18	2	1
H61	Outlier	Houma	21	10	10	1	1	5	1	3	1	21	7	7	7	5
LC27	Outlier	Lake Charles	2	2	2	11	11	13	12	6	7	2	10	9	8	5
LC36	Outlier	Lake Charles	1	1	1	1	1	50	1	1	1	14	25	1	1	1
NO16	Outlier	New Orleans	20	13	30	1	1	3	1	1	1	15	5	6	2	1
NO18	Outlier	New Orleans	2	2	5	5	20	20	3	10	2	5	3	3	10	10
NO3	Outlier	New Orleans	2	2	2	2	10	10	10	2	2	2	50	2	2	2
NO4	Outlier	New Orleans	2	2	2	2	10	10	10	2	2	2	50	2	2	2
NO5	Outlier	New Orleans	10	10	10	5	5	5	1	3	2	3	3	3	35	5

Attachment 4 – Consumer Reports Analysis of Results – Planning Unit 1

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

3

4 Table A4-1. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU1-NS-400	0.811	579151	51	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	328144	1667	85001	53294	50
5	PU1-NS-100	0.810	863308	25	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	653206	2857	167590	54527	50
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.810	532170	65	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	299321	1553	77217	46746	50
2	PU1-R1	0.750	1696702	9	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
3	PU1-R2	0.746	1696702	11	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
4	PU1-R3	0.733	1696702	15	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.715	1195272	33	12	0.445	-3642	233914	-1	133	271	1015087	4536	280490	53452	50
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.700	1461284	29	12	0.445	-3642	233914	-1	133	271	1217614	5182	323398	54741	50
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.690	1197582	36	12	0.445	-4686	233914	-2	143	273	989333	4454	271884	52519	50
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.677	1418528	32	12	0.445	-4686	233914	-2	143	273	1169442	5024	309917	53610	50
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.646	1139270	64	16	0.445	-5661	233914	-1	143	273	935066	4276	259110	52901	50
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.643	1185545	27	14	0.445	-980	233914	-8	133	231	1050337	4591	289686	54725	50
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.629	1427975	58	16	0.445	-5661	233914	-1	143	273	1171181	5037	312121	54462	50
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.615	1542812	22	14	0.445	-980	233914	-8	133	231	1421589	5902	374114	56917	50
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.593	1223270	40	14	0.445	-3668	233914	-8	133	271	1049819	4688	291033	53028	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.580	1447693	35	14	0.445	-3668	233914	-8	133	271	1242613	5309	332087	54551	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.576	1086290	50	16	0.445	-4238	233914	-8	137	233	869709	3970	241444	54053	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.575	1226316	43	14	0.445	-4541	233914	-8	133	231	1021151	4586	280904	52357	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.564	1419610	37	14	0.445	-4541	233914	-8	133	231	1195432	5136	317983	53682	50
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.558	1074066	59	16	0.445	-5100	233914	-8	137	273	858247	3928	238414	53429	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.544	1498743	41	16	0.445	-4238	233914	-8	137	233	1342300	5629	353747	56335	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.527	1496191	48	16	0.445	-5100	233914	-8	137	273	1339226	5617	352890	56288	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.506	1156847	68	16	0.445	-7587	233914	-8	146	233	935042	4264	258323	52459	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.493	1399093	59	16	0.445	-7587	233914	-8	146	233	1172002	5050	313300	54022	50
1	PU1-0	0.481	1834963	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	126	91	1881351	7217	496578	62905	46
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.464	1165482	82	16	0.445	-10081	233914	-8	159	273	942025	4305	260292	51543	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.457	1368630	72	16	0.445	-10081	233914	-8	159	273	1125709	4879	299622	53165	50

5

6

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

7 Table A4-2. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU1-NS-400	0.804	587799	51	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	346328	1718	90058	53847	48
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.804	535322	65	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	304859	1571	78852	47299	48
5	PU1-NS-100	0.798	931367	25	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	740355	3116	191023	55080	48
2	PU1-R1	0.736	1776179	10	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
3	PU1-R2	0.732	1776179	11	15	0.478	0	220284	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
4	PU1-R3	0.719	1776179	16	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.701	1262525	34	12	0.445	-3642	239185	-1	128	271	1138424	4866	311102	54064	48
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.686	1515587	30	12	0.445	-3642	239185	-1	128	271	1332607	5490	351920	55360	48
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.675	1252505	36	12	0.445	-4686	239185	-2	134	273	1092648	4718	296144	52984	48
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.662	1464440	32	12	0.445	-4686	239185	-2	134	273	1267169	5273	332940	54077	48
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.636	1200785	64	16	0.445	-5661	239185	-1	141	273	1079910	4652	293612	53679	49
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.617	1499423	59	16	0.445	-5661	239185	-1	141	273	1329125	5452	350482	55248	49
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.614	1292684	28	14	0.445	-980	239185	-8	129	231	1247351	5119	337276	56026	45
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.587	1636730	23	14	0.445	-980	239185	-8	129	231	1594713	6356	415734	58236	45
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.568	1294738	40	14	0.445	-3668	239185	-8	128	271	1183550	5032	323129	53776	45
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.564	1158213	50	16	0.445	-4238	239185	-8	133	233	1051780	4463	287746	55359	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.555	1510964	35	14	0.445	-3668	239185	-8	128	271	1373040	5639	363075	55307	45
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.550	1289624	43	14	0.445	-4541	239185	-8	128	231	1145453	4904	310334	52957	45
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.548	1133968	60	16	0.445	-5100	239185	-8	133	273	1015440	4345	277107	54715	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.540	1476297	38	14	0.445	-4541	239185	-8	128	231	1316804	5445	346616	54285	45
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.532	1597113	41	16	0.445	-4238	239185	-8	133	233	1532418	6125	399266	57659	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.515	1594561	49	16	0.445	-5100	239185	-8	133	273	1529345	6112	398409	57613	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.496	1223812	68	16	0.445	-7587	239185	-8	142	233	1106775	4719	300956	53282	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.484	1470610	59	16	0.445	-7587	239185	-8	142	233	1324708	5438	349504	54852	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.456	1225290	83	16	0.445	-10081	239185	-8	157	273	1083992	4668	293738	52234	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.450	1434378	72	16	0.445	-10081	239185	-8	157	273	1270169	5248	333761	53862	50
1	PU1-0	0.436	2075970	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	125	91	2457333	8688	632261	65438	44

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

10

11 Table A4-3. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU1-NS-100	0.837	834297	21	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	564372	2759	161025	48427	50
6	PU1-NS-400	0.835	563632	46	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	288300	1652	85247	47417	50
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.832	521115	59	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	262438	1536	77518	42417	50
2	PU1-R1	0.788	1643671	9	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
3	PU1-R2	0.784	1643671	11	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
4	PU1-R3	0.771	1643671	15	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.756	1161005	28	12	0.478	-3642	214687	-1	133	271	764010	3811	224804	44999	50
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.747	1340542	25	12	0.478	-3642	214687	-1	133	271	860099	4181	248135	45848	50
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.730	1163475	30	12	0.478	-4686	214687	-2	143	273	751731	3778	220881	44502	50
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.722	1309929	27	12	0.478	-4686	214687	-2	143	273	826900	4174	240082	45269	50
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.685	1134153	58	16	0.478	-5661	214687	-1	143	273	701081	3651	211920	44942	50
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.682	1143534	22	14	0.478	-980	214687	-8	133	231	806132	3880	236025	46828	50
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.675	1327298	54	16	0.478	-5661	214687	-1	143	273	819772	4094	241394	45915	50
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.662	1479342	18	14	0.478	-980	214687	-8	133	231	995235	4839	293424	48320	50
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.633	1192597	35	14	0.478	-3668	214687	-8	133	271	795052	3945	233479	45074	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.626	1347652	30	14	0.478	-3668	214687	-8	133	271	879957	4286	254953	46003	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.613	1196051	38	14	0.478	-4541	214687	-8	133	231	780946	3905	229138	44707	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.612	1054074	45	16	0.478	-4238	214687	-8	137	233	655788	3340	195134	46423	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.608	1325387	33	14	0.478	-4541	214687	-8	133	231	849447	4185	247281	45553	50
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.594	1043733	54	16	0.478	-5100	214687	-8	137	273	644404	3295	191844	46164	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.590	1443607	36	16	0.478	-4238	214687	-8	137	233	932400	4636	278568	47997	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.573	1441359	44	16	0.478	-5100	214687	-8	137	273	929643	4625	277839	47954	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.542	1143827	63	16	0.478	-7587	214687	-8	146	233	702411	3646	211602	44736	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.538	1310518	54	16	0.478	-7587	214687	-8	146	233	819293	4089	241111	45695	50
1	PU1-0	0.525	1760241	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	126	91	1326213	5895	391492	52034	46
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.500	1286213	67	16	0.478	-10081	214687	-8	159	273	787878	3980	233195	45221	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.499	1150526	78	16	0.478	-10081	214687	-8	159	273	708961	3681	213087	44293	50

12

13

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

14

15 Table A4-4. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU1-NS-400	0.816	570627	51	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	303236	1690	89263	47825	48
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.814	523406	64	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	266367	1548	78689	42825	48
5	PU1-NS-100	0.813	888272	25	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	646220	3018	185371	48835	48
2	PU1-R1	0.774	1731607	10	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
3	PU1-R2	0.771	1731607	11	15	0.478	0	220284	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
4	PU1-R3	0.758	1731607	16	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.731	1213625	33	12	0.445	-3642	239185	-1	128	271	863580	4060	248620	45394	48
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.723	1390264	30	12	0.445	-3642	239185	-1	128	271	953188	4415	270242	46247	48
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.703	1209283	35	12	0.445	-4686	239185	-2	134	273	838877	3986	240671	44831	48
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.697	1353258	32	12	0.445	-4686	239185	-2	134	273	908621	4275	258577	45600	48
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.663	1193602	63	16	0.445	-5661	239185	-1	141	273	822111	3943	239589	45473	49
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.653	1394292	59	16	0.445	-5661	239185	-1	141	273	949514	4414	271614	46450	49
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.642	1239299	27	14	0.445	-980	239185	-8	129	231	972901	4335	278404	47846	45
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.623	1573951	23	14	0.445	-980	239185	-8	129	231	1149659	5243	331527	49348	45
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.597	1253340	40	14	0.445	-3668	239185	-8	128	271	906612	4210	259039	45554	45
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.591	1405874	35	14	0.445	-3668	239185	-8	128	271	988237	4542	279447	46487	45
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.591	1119949	50	16	0.445	-4238	239185	-8	133	233	803689	3709	230579	47440	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.577	1251742	43	14	0.445	-4541	239185	-8	128	231	886101	4153	252978	45132	45
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.574	1102560	60	16	0.445	-5100	239185	-8	133	273	774907	3618	222719	47175	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.573	1378686	38	14	0.445	-4541	239185	-8	128	231	951349	4426	270204	45980	45
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.566	1542333	41	16	0.445	-4238	239185	-8	133	233	1099923	5067	319250	49021	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.549	1540086	49	16	0.445	-5100	239185	-8	133	273	1097165	5056	318521	48980	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.522	1205880	68	16	0.445	-7587	239185	-8	142	233	840061	3977	243276	45282	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.519	1377382	59	16	0.445	-7587	239185	-8	142	233	946384	4389	269868	46246	50
1	PU1-0	0.486	1997820	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	125	91	1808723	7049	500848	53921	44
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.482	1348764	72	16	0.445	-10081	239185	-8	157	273	909382	4269	260576	45722	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.481	1209443	83	16	0.445	-10081	239185	-8	157	273	828087	3966	240064	44790	50

16

17

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

18

19 Table A4-5. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

20

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.877	532170	65	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	299321	1553	77217	46746	50
5	PU1-NS-100	0.875	863308	25	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	653206	2857	167590	54527	50
6	PU1-NS-400	0.873	579151	51	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	328144	1667	85001	53294	50
2	PU1-R1	0.844	1696702	9	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
3	PU1-R2	0.839	1696702	11	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
4	PU1-R3	0.836	1696702	15	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.774	1195272	33	12	0.445	-3642	233914	-1	133	271	1015087	4536	280490	53452	50
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.766	1461284	29	12	0.445	-3642	233914	-1	133	271	1217614	5182	323398	54741	50
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.736	1197582	36	12	0.445	-4686	233914	-2	143	273	989333	4454	271884	52519	50
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.730	1418528	32	12	0.445	-4686	233914	-2	143	273	1169442	5024	309917	53610	50
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.712	1139270	64	16	0.445	-5661	233914	-1	143	273	935066	4276	259110	52901	50
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.704	1427975	58	16	0.445	-5661	233914	-1	143	273	1171181	5037	312121	54462	50
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.672	1185545	27	14	0.445	-980	233914	-8	133	231	1050337	4591	289686	54725	50
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.659	1542812	22	14	0.445	-980	233914	-8	133	231	1421589	5902	374114	56917	50
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.616	1223270	40	14	0.445	-3668	233914	-8	133	271	1049819	4688	291033	53028	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.610	1447693	35	14	0.445	-3668	233914	-8	133	271	1242613	5309	332087	54551	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.598	1086290	50	16	0.445	-4238	233914	-8	137	233	869709	3970	241444	54053	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.597	1226316	43	14	0.445	-4541	233914	-8	133	231	1021151	4586	280904	52357	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.592	1419610	37	14	0.445	-4541	233914	-8	133	231	1195432	5136	317983	53682	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.584	1498743	41	16	0.445	-4238	233914	-8	137	233	1342300	5629	353747	56335	50
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.579	1074066	59	16	0.445	-5100	233914	-8	137	273	858247	3928	238414	53429	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.564	1496191	48	16	0.445	-5100	233914	-8	137	273	1339226	5617	352890	56288	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.524	1156847	68	16	0.445	-7587	233914	-8	146	233	935042	4264	258323	52459	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.519	1399093	59	16	0.445	-7587	233914	-8	146	233	1172002	5050	313300	54022	50
1	PU1-0	0.481	1834963	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	126	91	1881351	7217	496578	62905	46
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.474	1165482	82	16	0.445	-10081	233914	-8	159	273	942025	4305	260292	51543	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.471	1368630	72	16	0.445	-10081	233914	-8	159	273	1125709	4879	299622	53165	50

21

22

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

23

24 Table A4-6. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.874	535322	65	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	304859	1571	78852	47299	48
6	PU1-NS-400	0.870	587799	51	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	346328	1718	90058	53847	48
5	PU1-NS-100	0.869	931367	25	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	740355	3116	191023	55080	48
2	PU1-R1	0.837	1776179	10	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
3	PU1-R2	0.833	1776179	11	15	0.478	0	220284	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
4	PU1-R3	0.830	1776179	16	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.767	1262525	34	12	0.445	-3642	239185	-1	128	271	1138424	4866	311102	54064	48
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.760	1515587	30	12	0.445	-3642	239185	-1	128	271	1332607	5490	351920	55360	48
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.729	1252505	36	12	0.445	-4686	239185	-2	134	273	1092648	4718	296144	52984	48
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.723	1464440	32	12	0.445	-4686	239185	-2	134	273	1267169	5273	332940	54077	48
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.710	1200785	64	16	0.445	-5661	239185	-1	141	273	1079910	4652	293612	53679	49
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.701	1499423	59	16	0.445	-5661	239185	-1	141	273	1329125	5452	350482	55248	49
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.653	1292684	28	14	0.445	-980	239185	-8	129	231	1247351	5119	337276	56026	45
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.640	1636730	23	14	0.445	-980	239185	-8	129	231	1594713	6356	415734	58236	45
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.600	1294738	40	14	0.445	-3668	239185	-8	128	271	1183550	5032	323129	53776	45
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.596	1158213	50	16	0.445	-4238	239185	-8	133	233	1051780	4463	287746	55359	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.593	1510964	35	14	0.445	-3668	239185	-8	128	271	1373040	5639	363075	55307	45
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.581	1289624	43	14	0.445	-4541	239185	-8	128	231	1145453	4904	310334	52957	45
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.581	1597113	41	16	0.445	-4238	239185	-8	133	233	1532418	6125	399266	57659	50
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.578	1133968	60	16	0.445	-5100	239185	-8	133	273	1015440	4345	277107	54715	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.576	1476297	38	14	0.445	-4541	239185	-8	128	231	1316804	5445	346616	54285	45
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.562	1594561	49	16	0.445	-5100	239185	-8	133	273	1529345	6112	398409	57613	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.523	1223812	68	16	0.445	-7587	239185	-8	142	233	1106775	4719	300956	53282	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.518	1470610	59	16	0.445	-7587	239185	-8	142	233	1324708	5438	349504	54852	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.474	1225290	83	16	0.445	-10081	239185	-8	157	273	1083992	4668	293738	52234	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.471	1434378	72	16	0.445	-10081	239185	-8	157	273	1270169	5248	333761	53862	50
1	PU1-0	0.455	2075970	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	125	91	2457333	8688	632261	65438	44

25

26

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

27

28 Table A4-7. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU1-NS-100	0.890	834297	21	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	564372	2759	161025	48427	50
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.888	521115	59	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	262438	1536	77518	42417	50
6	PU1-NS-400	0.886	563632	46	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	288300	1652	85247	47417	50
2	PU1-R1	0.871	1643671	9	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
3	PU1-R2	0.866	1643671	11	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
4	PU1-R3	0.862	1643671	15	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.798	1161005	28	12	0.478	-3642	214687	-1	133	271	764010	3811	224804	44999	50
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.793	1340542	25	12	0.478	-3642	214687	-1	133	271	860099	4181	248135	45848	50
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.759	1163475	30	12	0.478	-4686	214687	-2	143	273	751731	3778	220881	44502	50
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.755	1309929	27	12	0.478	-4686	214687	-2	143	273	826900	4174	240082	45269	50
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.735	1134153	58	16	0.478	-5661	214687	-1	143	273	701081	3651	211920	44942	50
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.730	1327298	54	16	0.478	-5661	214687	-1	143	273	819772	4094	241394	45915	50
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.695	1143534	22	14	0.478	-980	214687	-8	133	231	806132	3880	236025	46828	50
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.685	1479342	18	14	0.478	-980	214687	-8	133	231	995235	4839	293424	48320	50
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.639	1192597	35	14	0.478	-3668	214687	-8	133	271	795052	3945	233479	45074	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.636	1347652	30	14	0.478	-3668	214687	-8	133	271	879957	4286	254953	46003	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.619	1054074	45	16	0.478	-4238	214687	-8	137	233	655788	3340	195134	46423	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.619	1196051	38	14	0.478	-4541	214687	-8	133	231	780946	3905	229138	44707	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.617	1325387	33	14	0.478	-4541	214687	-8	133	231	849447	4185	247281	45553	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.609	1443607	36	16	0.478	-4238	214687	-8	137	233	932400	4636	278568	47997	50
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.600	1043733	54	16	0.478	-5100	214687	-8	137	273	644404	3295	191844	46164	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.590	1441359	44	16	0.478	-5100	214687	-8	137	273	929643	4625	277839	47954	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.545	1143827	63	16	0.478	-7587	214687	-8	146	233	702411	3646	211602	44736	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.544	1310518	54	16	0.478	-7587	214687	-8	146	233	819293	4089	241111	45695	50
1	PU1-0	0.511	1760241	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	126	91	1326213	5895	391492	52034	46
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.495	1286213	67	16	0.478	-10081	214687	-8	159	273	787878	3980	233195	45221	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.494	1150526	78	16	0.478	-10081	214687	-8	159	273	708961	3681	213087	44293	50

29

30

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

31

32 Table A4-8. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.883	523406	64	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	266367	1548	78689	42825	48
5	PU1-NS-100	0.882	888272	25	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	646220	3018	185371	48835	48
6	PU1-NS-400	0.881	570627	51	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	303236	1690	89263	47825	48
2	PU1-R1	0.864	1731607	10	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
3	PU1-R2	0.860	1731607	11	15	0.478	0	220284	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
4	PU1-R3	0.856	1731607	16	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.789	1213625	33	12	0.445	-3642	239185	-1	128	271	863580	4060	248620	45394	48
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.785	1390264	30	12	0.445	-3642	239185	-1	128	271	953188	4415	270242	46247	48
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.750	1209283	35	12	0.445	-4686	239185	-2	134	273	838877	3986	240671	44831	48
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.746	1353258	32	12	0.445	-4686	239185	-2	134	273	908621	4275	258577	45600	48
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.730	1193602	63	16	0.445	-5661	239185	-1	141	273	822111	3943	239589	45473	49
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.725	1394292	59	16	0.445	-5661	239185	-1	141	273	949514	4414	271614	46450	49
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.674	1239299	27	14	0.445	-980	239185	-8	129	231	972901	4335	278404	47846	45
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.664	1573951	23	14	0.445	-980	239185	-8	129	231	1149659	5243	331527	49348	45
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.620	1253340	40	14	0.445	-3668	239185	-8	128	271	906612	4210	259039	45554	45
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.618	1405874	35	14	0.445	-3668	239185	-8	128	271	988237	4542	279447	46487	45
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.615	1119949	50	16	0.445	-4238	239185	-8	133	233	803689	3709	230579	47440	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.604	1542333	41	16	0.445	-4238	239185	-8	133	233	1099923	5067	319250	49021	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.601	1251742	43	14	0.445	-4541	239185	-8	128	231	886101	4153	252978	45132	45
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.599	1378686	38	14	0.445	-4541	239185	-8	128	231	951349	4426	270204	45980	45
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.596	1102560	60	16	0.445	-5100	239185	-8	133	273	774907	3618	222719	47175	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.585	1540086	49	16	0.445	-5100	239185	-8	133	273	1097165	5056	318521	48980	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.543	1205880	68	16	0.445	-7587	239185	-8	142	233	840061	3977	243276	45282	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.542	1377382	59	16	0.445	-7587	239185	-8	142	233	946384	4389	269868	46246	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.493	1348764	72	16	0.445	-10081	239185	-8	157	273	909382	4269	260576	45722	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.492	1209443	83	16	0.445	-10081	239185	-8	157	273	828087	3966	240064	44790	50
1	PU1-0	0.488	1997820	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	125	91	1808723	7049	500848	53921	44

33

34

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

35

36 Table A4-9. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

37

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.764	532170	59	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	299321	1553	77217	46746	50
6	PU1-NS-400	0.762	579151	45	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	328144	1667	85001	53294	50
5	PU1-NS-100	0.750	863308	19	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	653206	2857	167590	54527	50
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.664	1195272	28	12	0.477	-3642	218822	-1	133	271	1015087	4536	280490	53452	50
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.659	1197582	30	12	0.477	-4686	218822	-2	143	273	989333	4454	271884	52519	50
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.624	1418528	26	12	0.477	-4686	218822	-2	143	273	1169442	5024	309917	53610	50
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.622	1461284	23	12	0.477	-3642	218822	-1	133	271	1217614	5182	323398	54741	50
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.616	1185545	22	14	0.477	-980	218822	-8	133	231	1050337	4591	289686	54725	50
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.596	1139270	58	16	0.477	-5661	218822	-1	143	273	935066	4276	259110	52901	50
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.594	1223270	34	14	0.477	-3668	218822	-8	133	271	1049819	4688	291033	53028	50
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.575	1074066	53	16	0.477	-5100	218822	-8	137	273	858247	3928	238414	53429	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.575	1086290	44	16	0.477	-4238	218822	-8	137	233	869709	3970	241444	54053	50
2	PU1-R1	0.569	1696702	9	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.568	1226316	37	14	0.477	-4541	218822	-8	133	231	1021151	4586	280904	52357	50
3	PU1-R2	0.566	1696702	11	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.558	1447693	29	14	0.477	-3668	218822	-8	133	271	1242613	5309	332087	54551	50
4	PU1-R3	0.550	1696702	15	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.549	1427975	53	16	0.477	-5661	218822	-1	143	273	1171181	5037	312121	54462	50
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.547	1542812	17	14	0.477	-980	218822	-8	133	231	1421589	5902	374114	56917	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.538	1419610	32	14	0.477	-4541	218822	-8	133	231	1195432	5136	317983	53682	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.514	1156847	62	16	0.477	-7587	218822	-8	146	233	935042	4264	258323	52459	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.499	1498743	35	16	0.477	-4238	218822	-8	137	233	1342300	5629	353747	56335	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.498	1496191	43	16	0.477	-5100	218822	-8	137	273	1339226	5617	352890	56288	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.498	1165482	76	16	0.477	-10081	218822	-8	159	273	942025	4305	260292	51543	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.480	1399093	53	16	0.477	-7587	218822	-8	146	233	1172002	5050	313300	54022	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.477	1368630	66	16	0.477	-10081	218822	-8	159	273	1125709	4879	299622	53165	50
1	PU1-0	0.416	1834963	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	126	91	1881351	7217	496578	62905	46

38

39

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

40

41 Table A4-10. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.753	535322	59	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	304859	1571	78852	47299	48
6	PU1-NS-400	0.750	587799	45	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	346328	1718	90058	53847	48
5	PU1-NS-100	0.725	931361	20	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	740355	3116	191023	55080	48
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.636	1262525	28	12	0.477	-3642	223705	-1	128	271	1138424	4866	311102	54064	48
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.632	1252505	30	12	0.477	-4686	223705	-2	134	273	1092648	4718	296144	52984	48
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.598	1464440	26	12	0.477	-4686	223705	-2	134	273	1267169	5273	332940	54077	48
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.596	1515587	24	12	0.477	-3642	223705	-1	128	271	1332607	5490	351920	55360	48
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.571	1200785	58	16	0.477	-5661	223705	-1	141	273	1079910	4652	293612	53679	49
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.565	1292684	22	14	0.477	-980	223705	-8	129	231	1247351	5119	337276	56026	45
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.554	1294738	35	14	0.477	-3668	223705	-8	128	271	1183550	5032	323129	53776	45
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.550	1133968	54	16	0.477	-5100	223705	-8	133	273	1015440	4345	277107	54715	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.546	1158213	44	16	0.477	-4238	223705	-8	133	233	1051780	4463	287746	55359	50
2	PU1-R1	0.540	1776179	10	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
3	PU1-R2	0.537	1776179	11	15	0.478	0	220284	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.530	1289624	37	14	0.477	-4541	223705	-8	128	231	1145453	4904	310334	52957	45
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.522	1499423	53	16	0.477	-5661	223705	-1	141	273	1329125	5452	350482	55248	49
4	PU1-R3	0.521	1776179	16	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.519	1510964	29	14	0.477	-3668	223705	-8	128	271	1373040	5639	363075	55307	45
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.501	1476297	32	14	0.477	-4541	223705	-8	128	231	1316804	5445	346616	54285	45
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.500	1636730	17	14	0.477	-980	223705	-8	129	231	1594713	6356	415734	58236	45
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.489	1223812	62	16	0.477	-7587	223705	-8	142	233	1106775	4719	300956	53282	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.477	1225290	77	16	0.477	-10081	223705	-8	157	273	1083992	4668	293738	52234	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.467	1597113	35	16	0.477	-4238	223705	-8	133	233	1532418	6125	399266	57659	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.466	1594561	43	16	0.477	-5100	223705	-8	133	273	1529345	6112	398409	57613	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.456	1470610	53	16	0.477	-7587	223705	-8	142	233	1324708	5438	349504	54852	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.455	1434378	67	16	0.477	-10081	223705	-8	157	273	1270169	5248	333761	53862	50
1	PU1-0	0.330	2075970	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	125	91	2457333	8688	632261	65438	44

42

43

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

44

45 Table A4-11. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU1-NS-400	0.785	563632	45	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	288300	1652	85247	47417	50
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.783	521115	58	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	262438	1536	77518	42417	50
5	PU1-NS-100	0.779	834296	19	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	564372	2759	161025	48427	50
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.719	1161005	26	12	0.477	-3642	218822	-1	133	271	764010	3811	224804	44999	50
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.711	1163475	29	12	0.477	-4686	218822	-2	143	273	751731	3778	220881	44502	50
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.693	1340542	23	12	0.477	-3642	218822	-1	133	271	860099	4181	248135	45848	50
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.689	1309929	26	12	0.477	-4686	218822	-2	143	273	826900	4174	240082	45269	50
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.668	1143534	21	14	0.477	-980	218822	-8	133	231	806132	3880	236025	46828	50
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.646	1192597	34	14	0.477	-3668	218822	-8	133	271	795052	3945	233479	45074	50
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.644	1134153	57	16	0.477	-5661	218822	-1	143	273	701081	3651	211920	44942	50
2	PU1-R1	0.642	1643671	9	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
3	PU1-R2	0.639	1643671	11	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.627	1347652	29	14	0.477	-3668	218822	-8	133	271	879957	4286	254953	46003	50
4	PU1-R3	0.623	1643671	15	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.622	1054074	44	16	0.477	-4238	218822	-8	137	233	655788	3340	195134	46423	50
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.620	1043733	53	16	0.477	-5100	218822	-8	137	273	644404	3295	191844	46164	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.617	1196051	36	14	0.477	-4541	218822	-8	133	231	780946	3905	229138	44707	50
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.616	1327298	53	16	0.477	-5661	218822	-1	143	273	819772	4094	241394	45915	50
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.613	1479342	17	14	0.477	-980	218822	-8	133	231	995235	4839	293424	48320	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.603	1325387	32	14	0.477	-4541	218822	-8	133	231	849447	4185	247281	45553	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.562	1443607	35	16	0.477	-4238	218822	-8	137	233	932400	4636	278568	47997	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.561	1441359	43	16	0.477	-5100	218822	-8	137	273	929643	4625	277839	47954	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.559	1143827	62	16	0.477	-7587	218822	-8	146	233	702411	3646	211602	44736	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.545	1310518	53	16	0.477	-7587	218822	-8	146	233	819293	4089	241111	45695	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.542	1150526	76	16	0.477	-10081	218822	-8	159	273	708961	3681	213087	44293	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.538	1286213	66	16	0.477	-10081	218822	-8	159	273	787878	3980	233195	45221	50
1	PU1-0	0.500	1760241	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	126	91	1326213	5895	391492	52034	46

46

47

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

48

49 Table A4-12. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU1-NS-400	0.774	570627	45	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	303236	1690	89263	47825	48
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.773	523406	58	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	266367	1548	78689	42825	48
5	PU1-NS-100	0.756	888272	20	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	646220	3018	185371	48835	48
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.695	1213625	27	12	0.477	-3642	223705	-1	128	271	863580	4060	248620	45394	48
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.687	1209283	29	12	0.477	-4686	223705	-2	134	273	838877	3986	240671	44831	48
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.670	1390264	24	12	0.477	-3642	223705	-1	128	271	953188	4415	270242	46247	48
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.666	1353258	26	12	0.477	-4686	223705	-2	134	273	908621	4275	258577	45600	48
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.622	1193602	57	16	0.477	-5661	223705	-1	141	273	822111	3943	239589	45473	49
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.621	1239299	22	14	0.477	-980	223705	-8	129	231	972901	4335	278404	47846	45
2	PU1-R1	0.613	1731607	10	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
3	PU1-R2	0.610	1731607	11	15	0.478	0	220284	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.610	1253340	34	14	0.477	-3668	223705	-8	128	271	906612	4210	259039	45554	45
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.598	1102560	54	16	0.477	-5100	223705	-8	133	273	774907	3618	222719	47175	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.598	1119949	44	16	0.477	-4238	223705	-8	133	233	803689	3709	230579	47440	50
4	PU1-R3	0.593	1731607	16	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.593	1394292	53	16	0.477	-5661	223705	-1	141	273	949514	4414	271614	46450	49
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.591	1405874	29	14	0.477	-3668	223705	-8	128	271	988237	4542	279447	46487	45
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.582	1251742	37	14	0.477	-4541	223705	-8	128	231	886101	4153	252978	45132	45
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.569	1573951	17	14	0.477	-980	223705	-8	129	231	1149659	5243	331527	49348	45
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.568	1378686	32	14	0.477	-4541	223705	-8	128	231	951349	4426	270204	45980	45
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.538	1205880	62	16	0.477	-7587	223705	-8	142	233	840061	3977	243276	45282	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.532	1542333	35	16	0.477	-4238	223705	-8	133	233	1099923	5067	319250	49021	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.531	1540086	43	16	0.477	-5100	223705	-8	133	273	1097165	5056	318521	48980	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.524	1377382	53	16	0.477	-7587	223705	-8	142	233	946384	4389	269868	46246	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.523	1209443	77	16	0.477	-10081	223705	-8	157	273	828087	3966	240064	44790	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.519	1348764	67	16	0.477	-10081	223705	-8	157	273	909382	4269	260576	45722	50
1	PU1-0	0.425	1997820	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	125	91	1808723	7049	500848	53921	44

50

51

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

52

53 Table A4-13. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

54

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.828	532170	59	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	299321	1553	77217	46746	50
6	PU1-NS-400	0.798	579151	45	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	328144	1667	85001	53294	50
5	PU1-NS-100	0.764	863308	19	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	653206	2857	167590	54527	50
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.687	1197582	30	12	0.477	-4686	218822	-2	143	273	989333	4454	271884	52519	50
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.683	1195272	28	12	0.477	-3642	218822	-1	133	271	1015087	4536	280490	53452	50
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.666	1139270	58	16	0.477	-5661	218822	-1	143	273	935066	4276	259110	52901	50
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.657	1418528	26	12	0.477	-4686	218822	-2	143	273	1169442	5024	309917	53610	50
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.648	1461284	23	12	0.477	-3642	218822	-1	133	271	1217614	5182	323398	54741	50
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.626	1427975	53	16	0.477	-5661	218822	-1	143	273	1171181	5037	312121	54462	50
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.609	1185545	22	14	0.477	-980	218822	-8	133	231	1050337	4591	289686	54725	50
2	PU1-R1	0.607	1696702	9	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
3	PU1-R2	0.604	1696702	11	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
4	PU1-R3	0.600	1696702	15	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	1610677	6378	421741	60722	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.595	1086290	44	16	0.477	-4238	218822	-8	137	233	869709	3970	241444	54053	50
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.593	1074066	53	16	0.477	-5100	218822	-8	137	273	858247	3928	238414	53429	50
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.592	1223270	34	14	0.477	-3668	218822	-8	133	271	1049819	4688	291033	53028	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.583	1226316	37	14	0.477	-4541	218822	-8	133	231	1021151	4586	280904	52357	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.574	1165482	76	16	0.477	-10081	218822	-8	159	273	942025	4305	260292	51543	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.570	1156847	62	16	0.477	-7587	218822	-8	146	233	935042	4264	258323	52459	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.559	1447693	29	14	0.477	-3668	218822	-8	133	271	1242613	5309	332087	54551	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.554	1419610	32	14	0.477	-4541	218822	-8	133	231	1195432	5136	317983	53682	50
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.550	1542812	17	14	0.477	-980	218822	-8	133	231	1421589	5902	374114	56917	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.547	1368630	66	16	0.477	-10081	218822	-8	159	273	1125709	4879	299622	53165	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.535	1399093	53	16	0.477	-7587	218822	-8	146	233	1172002	5050	313300	54022	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.526	1498743	35	16	0.477	-4238	218822	-8	137	233	1342300	5629	353747	56335	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.521	1496191	43	16	0.477	-5100	218822	-8	137	273	1339226	5617	352890	56288	50
1	PU1-0	0.354	1834963	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	126	91	1881351	7217	496578	62905	46

55

56

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

57

58 Table A4-14. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.806	535322	59	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	304859	1571	78852	47299	48
6	PU1-NS-400	0.775	587799	45	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	346328	1718	90058	53847	48
5	PU1-NS-100	0.731	931361	20	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	740355	3116	191023	55080	48
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.645	1252505	30	12	0.477	-4686	223705	-2	134	273	1092648	4718	296144	52984	48
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.645	1262525	28	12	0.477	-3642	223705	-1	128	271	1138424	4866	311102	54064	48
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.639	1200785	58	16	0.477	-5661	223705	-1	141	273	1079910	4652	293612	53679	49
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.615	1464440	26	12	0.477	-4686	223705	-2	134	273	1267169	5273	332940	54077	48
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.611	1515587	24	12	0.477	-3642	223705	-1	128	271	1332607	5490	351920	55360	48
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.597	1499423	53	16	0.477	-5661	223705	-1	141	273	1329125	5452	350482	55248	49
2	PU1-R1	0.570	1776179	10	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
3	PU1-R2	0.568	1776179	11	15	0.478	0	220284	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.567	1133968	54	16	0.477	-5100	223705	-8	133	273	1015440	4345	277107	54715	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.566	1158213	44	16	0.477	-4238	223705	-8	133	233	1051780	4463	287746	55359	50
4	PU1-R3	0.563	1776179	16	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	1712062	6679	448400	61786	48
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.556	1225290	77	16	0.477	-10081	223705	-8	157	273	1083992	4668	293738	52234	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.546	1223812	62	16	0.477	-7587	223705	-8	142	233	1106775	4719	300956	53282	50
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.536	1292684	22	14	0.477	-980	223705	-8	129	231	1247351	5119	337276	56026	45
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.528	1434378	67	16	0.477	-10081	223705	-8	157	273	1270169	5248	333761	53862	50
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.527	1294738	35	14	0.477	-3668	223705	-8	128	271	1183550	5032	323129	53776	45
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.520	1289624	37	14	0.477	-4541	223705	-8	128	231	1145453	4904	310334	52957	45
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.511	1470610	53	16	0.477	-7587	223705	-8	142	233	1324708	5438	349504	54852	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.495	1597113	35	16	0.477	-4238	223705	-8	133	233	1532418	6125	399266	57659	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.495	1510964	29	14	0.477	-3668	223705	-8	128	271	1373040	5639	363075	55307	45
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.492	1476297	32	14	0.477	-4541	223705	-8	128	231	1316804	5445	346616	54285	45
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.491	1594561	43	16	0.477	-5100	223705	-8	133	273	1529345	6112	398409	57613	50
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.480	1636730	17	14	0.477	-980	223705	-8	129	231	1594713	6356	415734	58236	45
1	PU1-0	0.267	2075970	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	125	91	2457333	8688	632261	65438	44

59

60

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

61

62 Table A4-15. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.850	521115	59	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	262438	1536	77518	42417	50
6	PU1-NS-400	0.827	563632	46	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	288300	1652	85247	47417	50
5	PU1-NS-100	0.798	834297	21	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	564372	2759	161025	48427	50
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.745	1163475	30	12	0.478	-4686	214687	-2	143	273	751731	3778	220881	44502	50
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.744	1161005	28	12	0.478	-3642	214687	-1	133	271	764010	3811	224804	44999	50
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.726	1309929	27	12	0.478	-4686	214687	-2	143	273	826900	4174	240082	45269	50
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.723	1340542	25	12	0.478	-3642	214687	-1	133	271	860099	4181	248135	45848	50
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.721	1134153	58	16	0.478	-5661	214687	-1	143	273	701081	3651	211920	44942	50
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.697	1327298	54	16	0.478	-5661	214687	-1	143	273	819772	4094	241394	45915	50
2	PU1-R1	0.692	1643671	9	15	0.477	0	218822	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
3	PU1-R2	0.689	1643671	11	15	0.478	0	214687	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
4	PU1-R3	0.685	1643671	15	15	0.445	0	233914	0	134	231	1132353	5296	336856	50527	50
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.667	1143534	22	14	0.478	-980	214687	-8	133	231	806132	3880	236025	46828	50
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.650	1192597	35	14	0.478	-3668	214687	-8	133	271	795052	3945	233479	45074	50
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.648	1054074	45	16	0.478	-4238	214687	-8	137	233	655788	3340	195134	46423	50
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.645	1043733	54	16	0.478	-5100	214687	-8	137	273	644404	3295	191844	46164	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.638	1196051	38	14	0.478	-4541	214687	-8	133	231	780946	3905	229138	44707	50
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.632	1347652	30	14	0.478	-3668	214687	-8	133	271	879957	4286	254953	46003	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.625	1150526	78	16	0.478	-10081	214687	-8	159	273	708961	3681	213087	44293	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.624	1143827	63	16	0.478	-7587	214687	-8	146	233	702411	3646	211602	44736	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.623	1325387	33	14	0.478	-4541	214687	-8	133	231	849447	4185	247281	45553	50
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.622	1479342	18	14	0.478	-980	214687	-8	133	231	995235	4839	293424	48320	50
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.612	1286213	67	16	0.478	-10081	214687	-8	159	273	787878	3980	233195	45221	50
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.604	1310518	54	16	0.478	-7587	214687	-8	146	233	819293	4089	241111	45695	50
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.595	1443607	36	16	0.478	-4238	214687	-8	137	233	932400	4636	278568	47997	50
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.590	1441359	44	16	0.478	-5100	214687	-8	137	273	929643	4625	277839	47954	50
1	PU1-0	0.449	1760241	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	126	91	1326213	5895	391492	52034	46

63

64

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A4-16. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-1, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU1-NS-1000	0.831	523406	58	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	266367	1548	78689	42825	48
6	PU1-NS-400	0.808	570627	45	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	303236	1690	89263	47825	48
5	PU1-NS-100	0.770	888272	20	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	646220	3018	185371	48835	48
25	PU1-C-HL-a-100-3	0.713	1213625	27	12	0.477	-3642	223705	-1	128	271	863580	4060	248620	45394	48
26	PU1-C-HL-a-100-2	0.708	1209283	29	12	0.477	-4686	223705	-2	134	273	838877	3986	240671	44831	48
27	PU1-C-HL-b-400-3	0.700	1193602	57	16	0.477	-5661	223705	-1	141	273	822111	3943	239589	45473	49
15	PU1-HL-a-100-3	0.692	1390264	24	12	0.477	-3642	223705	-1	128	271	953188	4415	270242	46247	48
16	PU1-HL-a-100-2	0.691	1353258	26	12	0.477	-4686	223705	-2	134	273	908621	4275	258577	45600	48
17	PU1-HL-b-400-3	0.675	1394292	53	16	0.477	-5661	223705	-1	141	273	949514	4414	271614	46450	49
2	PU1-R1	0.655	1731607	10	15	0.477	0	223705	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
3	PU1-R2	0.653	1731607	11	15	0.478	0	220284	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
4	PU1-R3	0.649	1731607	16	15	0.445	0	239185	0	131	231	1233041	5615	366103	51303	48
21	PU1-C-LP-b-400-1	0.627	1119949	44	16	0.477	-4238	223705	-8	133	233	803689	3709	230579	47440	50
23	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-1	0.626	1102560	54	16	0.477	-5100	223705	-8	133	273	774907	3618	222719	47175	50
24	PU1-C-LP-b-1000-2	0.613	1209443	77	16	0.477	-10081	223705	-8	157	273	828087	3966	240064	44790	50
22	PU1-C-LP-b-400-3	0.606	1205880	62	16	0.477	-7587	223705	-8	142	233	840061	3977	243276	45282	50
18	PU1-C-LP-a-100-1	0.601	1239299	22	14	0.477	-980	223705	-8	129	231	972901	4335	278404	47846	45
14	PU1-LP-b-1000-2	0.600	1348764	67	16	0.477	-10081	223705	-8	157	273	909382	4269	260576	45722	50
20	PU1-C-LP-a-100-3	0.592	1253340	34	14	0.477	-3668	223705	-8	128	271	906612	4210	259039	45554	45
12	PU1-LP-b-400-3	0.587	1377382	53	16	0.477	-7587	223705	-8	142	233	946384	4389	269868	46246	50
19	PU1-C-LP-a-100-2	0.581	1251742	37	14	0.477	-4541	223705	-8	128	231	886101	4153	252978	45132	45
10	PU1-LP-a-100-3	0.574	1405874	29	14	0.477	-3668	223705	-8	128	271	988237	4542	279447	46487	45
11	PU1-LP-b-400-1	0.570	1542333	35	16	0.477	-4238	223705	-8	133	233	1099923	5067	319250	49021	50
9	PU1-LP-a-100-2	0.566	1378686	32	14	0.477	-4541	223705	-8	128	231	951349	4426	270204	45980	45
13	PU1-LP-b-1000-1	0.566	1540086	43	16	0.477	-5100	223705	-8	133	273	1097165	5056	318521	48980	50
8	PU1-LP-a-100-1	0.558	1573951	17	14	0.477	-980	223705	-8	129	231	1149659	5243	331527	49348	45
1	PU1-0	0.374	1997820	0	0	0.326	0	0	0	125	91	1808723	7049	500848	53921	44

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Attachment 5 – Consumer Reports Analysis of Results – Planning Unit 2

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

3 Table A5-1. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.835	398999	34	11	0.544	-993	134483	4	15	213	515881	1263	91435	11882	7
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.825	709633	26	6	0.544	0	134483	2	15	213	892369	2053	148179	24503	7
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.799	1322954	19	6	0.544	0	134483	2	15	213	1472086	3283	227156	25526	7
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.798	770970	31	11	0.544	-704	134483	4	15	213	963370	2358	169765	24225	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.785	784779	31	11	0.544	-1635	134483	4	15	224	938474	2360	166340	22732	7
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.776	335996	45	12	0.544	-3688	134483	2	26	213	417114	1079	79003	11428	9
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.775	338713	53	11	0.544	-4687	134483	4	26	213	399018	1053	74795	10359	9
5	PU2-NS-100	0.774	587968	25	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	534276	1411	90492	22778	5
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.773	1329816	26	11	0.544	-704	134483	4	15	213	1516824	3426	242008	25247	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.769	1270825	28	11	0.544	-993	134483	4	15	213	1481411	3334	236046	24302	7
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.762	315451	58	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	218656	594	33080	14548	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.761	333352	55	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	260290	705	40991	15513	5
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.758	1245782	31	11	0.544	-1635	134483	4	15	224	1410653	3208	225749	23755	7
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.732	674492	51	13	0.544	-4392	134483	4	26	213	801289	2078	149141	21758	9
4	PU2-R3	0.730	1344531	18	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.727	372680	37	11	0.544	-2241	134483	-8	26	449	472489	1169	83423	11078	9
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.715	720932	30	11	0.544	-969	134483	-8	26	449	862336	2108	150970	23705	9
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.711	1186348	46	11	0.544	-4687	134483	4	26	213	1374289	3009	212997	23375	9
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.711	703021	56	13	0.544	-5323	134483	4	26	224	822379	2151	152348	20359	9
3	PU2-R2	0.708	1344531	16	15	0.539	0	118802	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.706	1316447	37	12	0.544	-3688	134483	2	26	213	1489662	3366	236543	25461	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.702	1286531	43	13	0.544	-4392	134483	4	26	213	1479947	3299	235022	24838	9
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.689	1236296	26	11	0.544	-969	134483	-8	26	449	1407496	3190	223006	24728	9
2	PU2-R1	0.688	1344531	15	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.686	1207991	50	13	0.544	-5323	134483	4	26	224	1379131	3093	219611	23438	9
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.676	690931	64	13	0.544	-6787	134483	4	26	224	812285	2128	150663	19857	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.668	1140593	33	11	0.544	-2241	134483	-8	26	449	1312660	2903	205079	22727	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.651	1204194	57	13	0.544	-6787	134483	4	26	224	1375901	3082	218790	23376	9
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.603	374760	58	13	0.544	-7433	134483	-8	27	449	452579	1203	86014	10934	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.560	371052	67	13	0.544	-9458	134483	-8	27	449	449080	1200	85783	9972	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.541	1175806	53	13	0.544	-7433	134483	-8	27	449	1373341	3066	218239	23175	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.497	1175279	61	13	0.544	-9458	134483	-8	27	449	1372408	3064	218011	23161	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.418	1974025	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	14	48	2991696	6875	556953	33981	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

4 Table A5-2. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.833	423913	34	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	534811	1307	94920	11974	7
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.819	774064	26	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	1016429	2250	167979	24742	7
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.794	1368367	19	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	1549717	3401	240459	25785	7
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.792	832900	31	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	1070988	2571	189249	24532	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.780	837571	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	1023440	2540	182220	23028	7
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.775	351195	45	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	437880	1108	81850	11519	9
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.773	351847	54	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	416170	1077	77096	10442	9
5	PU2-NS-100	0.771	630120	25	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	617486	1529	102323	22875	5
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.768	1376248	26	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	1584189	3586	256562	25575	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.764	1314610	28	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	1548775	3495	250599	24630	7
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.762	320517	58	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	227009	605	34119	14618	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.761	344590	55	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	292390	754	45632	15585	5
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.754	1286650	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	1467220	3358	239037	24071	7
4	PU2-R3	0.728	1387351	18	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.727	399768	37	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	486069	1196	86105	11166	9
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.726	716654	51	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	886583	2285	167415	22082	9
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.709	800139	30	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	975409	2351	172375	24045	9
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.707	1230134	47	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	1441653	3169	227550	23702	9
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.706	743749	56	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	900066	2347	169590	20673	9
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.700	1370554	37	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	1590375	3569	256690	25814	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.697	1337811	44	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	1560048	3494	252743	25206	9
2	PU2-R1	0.687	1387351	15	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
3	PU2-R2	0.686	1387351	16	15	0.539	0	105958	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.686	1289766	26	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	1475181	3365	238345	25089	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.681	1254163	50	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	1449299	3280	236166	23797	9
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.672	727544	65	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	883763	2313	167063	20169	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.665	1180869	33	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	1368039	3052	218215	23047	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.647	1250356	58	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	1446068	3268	235345	23735	9
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.603	390283	59	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	468145	1231	88749	11022	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.560	382756	67	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	465274	1221	87965	10058	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.538	1221424	53	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	1442415	3252	234655	23522	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.494	1220896	61	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	1441482	3249	234428	23522	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.396	2143020	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	13	48	3349397	7832	642427	35319	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

5 Table A5-3. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.805	313731	29	11	0.535	-993	106376	4	15	213	425362	1070	75311	8898	7
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.805	544133	21	6	0.535	0	106376	2	15	213	740241	1755	122965	18090	7
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.786	912884	16	6	0.535	0	106376	2	15	213	1221997	2710	182786	19011	7
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.779	605505	26	11	0.535	-704	106376	4	15	213	802174	2011	140839	17893	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.763	609790	28	11	0.535	-1635	106376	4	15	224	782509	2013	138089	16632	7
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.761	913403	23	11	0.535	-704	106376	4	15	213	1256178	2794	193552	18814	7
4	PU2-R3	0.761	924948	18	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.756	884001	25	11	0.535	-993	106376	4	15	213	1225998	2731	189816	18215	7
5	PU2-NS-100	0.748	433278	20	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	524734	1511	92113	17007	5
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.746	267128	39	12	0.535	-3688	106376	2	26	213	347863	905	64857	9160	9
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.745	858188	28	11	0.535	-1635	106376	4	15	224	1165009	2625	181171	17553	7
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.744	266405	48	11	0.535	-4687	106376	4	26	213	333238	886	61381	8317	9
3	PU2-R2	0.738	924948	16	15	0.539	0	118802	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.731	196586	50	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	260120	798	43721	11633	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.731	211596	48	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	296905	900	50727	12266	5
2	PU2-R1	0.719	924948	15	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.709	536121	45	13	0.535	-4392	106376	4	26	213	674446	1763	123879	17254	9
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.697	807240	43	11	0.535	-4687	106376	4	26	213	1130872	2425	168804	17353	9
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.695	287314	34	11	0.535	-2241	106376	-8	26	449	386463	969	67270	8044	9
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.694	910562	33	12	0.535	-3688	106376	2	26	213	1237129	2746	189138	18992	9
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.693	554313	27	11	0.535	-969	106376	-8	26	449	714540	1768	123461	17249	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.690	875459	40	13	0.535	-4392	106376	4	26	213	1220305	2654	185944	18406	9
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.688	552034	50	13	0.535	-5323	106376	4	26	224	692947	1821	126260	16070	9
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.677	835849	23	11	0.535	-969	106376	-8	26	449	1167541	2592	177390	18170	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.673	823780	46	13	0.535	-5323	106376	4	26	224	1133873	2495	174206	17222	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.654	766613	30	11	0.535	-2241	106376	-8	26	449	1078730	2342	162361	16562	9
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.654	541929	58	13	0.535	-6787	106376	4	26	224	684698	1801	124835	15763	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.638	820239	54	13	0.535	-6787	106376	4	26	224	1130818	2484	173399	17162	9
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.571	297750	55	13	0.535	-7433	106376	-8	27	449	377208	1007	70452	7916	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.528	799671	50	13	0.535	-7433	106376	-8	27	449	1129344	2474	173124	16971	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.526	294965	63	13	0.535	-9458	106376	-8	27	449	374864	1005	70299	7847	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.484	799217	57	13	0.535	-9458	106376	-8	27	449	1128491	2471	172919	16958	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.463	1526056	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	14	48	2429045	5505	444675	25713	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

6 Table A5-4. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.846	330394	32	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	441889	1103	78087	8954	7
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.842	591730	24	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	845760	1914	139353	18286	7
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.825	953438	19	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	1292318	2811	194626	19221	7
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.816	649261	29	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	885709	2163	155006	18110	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.801	646630	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	846825	2140	149497	16831	7
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.800	952833	26	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	1310737	2913	204747	19045	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.794	921798	28	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	1280557	2849	201011	18446	7
5	PU2-NS-100	0.788	460629	24	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	594596	1608	101892	17093	5
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.786	279047	43	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	366890	931	67650	9227	9
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.785	276562	51	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	348713	908	63653	8367	9
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.784	892455	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	1210921	2734	191222	17668	7
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.774	198833	53	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	267357	810	44766	11705	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.773	218006	52	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	326817	947	55291	12340	5
4	PU2-R3	0.759	962540	18	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.747	571766	49	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	744669	1919	138039	17489	9
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.737	300899	37	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	396431	984	68821	8096	9
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.736	845037	47	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	1185431	2544	179998	17584	9
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.731	959919	37	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	1324351	2903	205626	19264	9
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.731	607363	30	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	801614	1939	138347	17520	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.728	919823	44	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	1285218	2799	199487	18667	9
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.726	586486	54	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	756434	1966	139482	16288	9
2	PU2-R1	0.718	962540	15	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
3	PU2-R2	0.717	962540	16	15	0.539	0	105958	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.716	883061	26	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	1223340	2723	189438	18456	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.711	863394	50	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	1190830	2631	186696	17467	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.694	800463	33	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	1123490	2449	172236	16776	9
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.693	573892	62	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	742626	1936	137216	15979	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.677	859853	58	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	1187776	2620	185890	17406	9
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.613	309120	59	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	390796	1029	72647	7969	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.568	304647	67	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	388792	1022	72116	7898	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.567	838901	53	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	1185242	2608	185437	17217	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.523	838447	61	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	1187515	2606	185232	17204	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.446	1685671	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	13	48	2719511	6198	508668	26679	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

7 Table A5-5. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.896	398999	34	11	0.544	-993	134483	4	15	213	515881	1263	91435	11882	7
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.878	709633	26	6	0.544	0	134483	2	15	213	892369	2053	148179	24503	7
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.873	770970	31	11	0.544	-704	134483	4	15	213	963370	2358	169765	24225	7
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.867	1322954	19	6	0.544	0	134483	2	15	213	1472086	3283	227156	25526	7
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.862	1329816	26	11	0.544	-704	134483	4	15	213	1516824	3426	242008	25247	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.857	1270825	28	11	0.544	-993	134483	4	15	213	1481411	3334	236046	24302	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.855	784779	31	11	0.544	-1635	134483	4	15	224	938474	2360	166340	22732	7
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.843	1245782	31	11	0.544	-1635	134483	4	15	224	1410653	3208	225749	23755	7
5	PU2-NS-100	0.829	587968	25	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	534276	1411	90492	22778	5
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.826	315451	58	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	218656	594	33080	14548	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.826	333352	55	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	260290	705	40991	15513	5
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.821	338713	53	11	0.544	-4687	134483	4	26	213	399018	1053	74795	10359	9
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.816	335996	45	12	0.544	-3688	134483	2	26	213	417114	1079	79003	11428	9
4	PU2-R3	0.809	1344531	18	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.795	674492	51	13	0.544	-4392	134483	4	26	213	801289	2078	149141	21758	9
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.783	1186348	46	11	0.544	-4687	134483	4	26	213	1374289	3009	212997	23375	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.781	1286531	43	13	0.544	-4392	134483	4	26	213	1479947	3299	235022	24838	9
3	PU2-R2	0.775	1344531	16	15	0.539	0	118802	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.774	1316447	37	12	0.544	-3688	134483	2	26	213	1489662	3366	236543	25461	9
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.774	703021	56	13	0.544	-5323	134483	4	26	224	822379	2151	152348	20359	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.762	1207991	50	13	0.544	-5323	134483	4	26	224	1379131	3093	219611	23438	9
2	PU2-R1	0.747	1344531	15	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.738	690931	64	13	0.544	-6787	134483	4	26	224	812285	2128	150663	19857	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.726	1204194	57	13	0.544	-6787	134483	4	26	224	1375901	3082	218790	23376	9
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.722	720932	30	11	0.544	-969	134483	-8	26	449	862336	2108	150970	23705	9
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.720	372680	37	11	0.544	-2241	134483	-8	26	449	472489	1169	83423	11078	9
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.711	1236296	26	11	0.544	-969	134483	-8	26	449	1407496	3190	223006	24728	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.685	1140593	33	11	0.544	-2241	134483	-8	26	449	1312660	2903	205079	22727	9
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.591	374760	58	13	0.544	-7433	134483	-8	27	449	452579	1203	86014	10934	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.554	1175806	53	13	0.544	-7433	134483	-8	27	449	1373341	3066	218239	23175	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.544	371052	67	13	0.544	-9458	134483	-8	27	449	449080	1200	85783	9972	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.506	1175279	61	13	0.544	-9458	134483	-8	27	449	1372408	3064	218011	23161	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.411	1974025	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	14	48	2991696	6875	556953	33981	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

8 Table A5-6. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.896	423913	34	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	534811	1307	94920	11974	7
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.876	774064	26	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	1016429	2250	167979	24742	7
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.871	832900	31	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	1070988	2571	189249	24532	7
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.866	1368367	19	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	1549717	3401	240459	25785	7
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.861	1376248	26	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	1584189	3586	256562	25575	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.856	1314610	28	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	1548775	3495	250599	24630	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.854	837571	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	1023440	2540	182220	23028	7
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.842	1286650	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	1467220	3358	239037	24071	7
5	PU2-NS-100	0.829	630120	25	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	617486	1529	102323	22875	5
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.828	320517	58	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	227009	605	34119	14618	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.827	344590	55	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	292390	754	45632	15585	5
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.822	351847	54	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	416170	1077	77096	10442	9
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.816	351195	45	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	437880	1108	81850	11519	9
4	PU2-R3	0.809	1387351	18	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.793	716654	51	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	886583	2285	167415	22082	9
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.782	1230134	47	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	1441653	3169	227550	23702	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.780	1337811	44	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	1560048	3494	252743	25206	9
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.772	1370554	37	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	1590375	3569	256690	25814	9
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.772	743749	56	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	900066	2347	169590	20673	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.760	1254163	50	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	1449299	3280	236166	23797	9
2	PU2-R1	0.748	1387351	15	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
3	PU2-R2	0.746	1387351	16	15	0.539	0	105958	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.737	727544	65	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	883763	2313	167063	20169	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.724	1250356	58	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	1446068	3268	235345	23735	9
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.721	399768	37	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	486069	1196	86105	11166	9
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.720	800139	30	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	975409	2351	172375	24045	9
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.710	1289766	26	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	1475181	3365	238345	25089	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.684	1180869	33	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	1368039	3052	218215	23047	9
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.592	390283	59	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	468145	1231	88749	11022	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.553	1221424	53	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	1442415	3252	234655	23522	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.545	382756	67	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	465274	1221	87965	10058	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.505	1220896	61	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	1441482	3249	234428	23522	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.399	2143020	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	13	48	3349397	7832	642427	35319	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

9 Table A5-7. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.842	313731	29	11	0.535	-993	106376	4	15	213	425362	1070	75311	8898	7
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.831	544133	21	6	0.535	0	106376	2	15	213	740241	1755	122965	18090	7
4	PU2-R3	0.829	924948	18	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.826	605505	26	11	0.535	-704	106376	4	15	213	802174	2011	140839	17893	7
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.824	912884	16	6	0.535	0	106376	2	15	213	1221997	2710	182786	19011	7
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.819	913403	23	11	0.535	-704	106376	4	15	213	1256178	2794	193552	18814	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.812	884001	25	11	0.535	-993	106376	4	15	213	1225998	2731	189816	18215	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.807	609790	28	11	0.535	-1635	106376	4	15	224	782509	2013	138089	16632	7
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.799	858188	28	11	0.535	-1635	106376	4	15	224	1165009	2625	181171	17553	7
3	PU2-R2	0.794	924948	16	15	0.539	0	118802	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
5	PU2-NS-100	0.779	433278	20	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	524734	1511	92113	17007	5
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.772	196586	50	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	260120	798	43721	11633	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.772	211596	48	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	296905	900	50727	12266	5
2	PU2-R1	0.766	924948	15	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.766	266405	48	11	0.535	-4687	106376	4	26	213	333238	886	61381	8317	9
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.761	267128	39	12	0.535	-3688	106376	2	26	213	347863	905	64857	9160	9
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.745	536121	45	13	0.535	-4392	106376	4	26	213	674446	1763	123879	17254	9
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.739	807240	43	11	0.535	-4687	106376	4	26	213	1130872	2425	168804	17353	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.738	875459	40	13	0.535	-4392	106376	4	26	213	1220305	2654	185944	18406	9
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.731	910562	33	12	0.535	-3688	106376	2	26	213	1237129	2746	189138	18992	9
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.724	552034	50	13	0.535	-5323	106376	4	26	224	692947	1821	126260	16070	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.718	823780	46	13	0.535	-5323	106376	4	26	224	1133873	2495	174206	17222	9
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.688	541929	58	13	0.535	-6787	106376	4	26	224	684698	1801	124835	15763	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.681	820239	54	13	0.535	-6787	106376	4	26	224	1130818	2484	173399	17162	9
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.674	554313	27	11	0.535	-969	106376	-8	26	449	714540	1768	123461	17249	9
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.667	835849	23	11	0.535	-969	106376	-8	26	449	1167541	2592	177390	18170	9
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.665	287314	34	11	0.535	-2241	106376	-8	26	449	386463	969	67270	8044	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.640	766613	30	11	0.535	-2241	106376	-8	26	449	1078730	2342	162361	16562	9
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.535	297750	55	13	0.535	-7433	106376	-8	27	449	377208	1007	70452	7916	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.509	799671	50	13	0.535	-7433	106376	-8	27	449	1129344	2474	173124	16971	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.487	294965	63	13	0.535	-9458	106376	-8	27	449	374864	1005	70299	7847	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.461	799217	57	13	0.535	-9458	106376	-8	27	449	1128491	2471	172919	16958	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.438	1526056	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	14	48	2429045	5505	444675	25713	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

10 Table A5-8. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.905	330394	32	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	441889	1103	78087	8954	7
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.893	591730	24	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	845760	1914	139353	18286	7
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.887	649261	29	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	885709	2163	155006	18110	7
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.886	953438	19	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	1292318	2811	194626	19221	7
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.880	952833	26	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	1310737	2913	204747	19045	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.874	921798	28	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	1280557	2849	201011	18446	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.869	646630	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	846825	2140	149497	16831	7
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.861	892455	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	1210921	2734	191222	17668	7
5	PU2-NS-100	0.842	460629	24	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	594596	1608	101892	17093	5
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.836	198833	53	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	267357	810	44766	11705	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.835	218006	52	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	326817	947	55291	12340	5
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.829	276562	51	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	348713	908	63653	8367	9
4	PU2-R3	0.829	962540	18	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.824	279047	43	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	366890	931	67650	9227	9
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.807	571766	49	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	744669	1919	138039	17489	9
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.800	845037	47	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	1185431	2544	179998	17584	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.799	919823	44	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	1285218	2799	199487	18667	9
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.792	959919	37	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	1324351	2903	205626	19264	9
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.786	586486	54	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	756434	1966	139482	16288	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.779	863394	50	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	1190830	2631	186696	17467	9
2	PU2-R1	0.768	962540	15	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
3	PU2-R2	0.766	962540	16	15	0.539	0	105958	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.750	573892	62	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	742626	1936	137216	15979	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.743	859853	58	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	1187776	2620	185890	17406	9
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.736	607363	30	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	801614	1939	138347	17520	9
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.729	883061	26	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	1223340	2723	189438	18456	9
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.729	300899	37	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	396431	984	68821	8096	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.703	800463	33	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	1123490	2449	172236	16776	9
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.599	309120	59	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	390796	1029	72647	7969	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.572	838901	53	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	1185242	2608	185437	17217	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.551	304647	67	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	388792	1022	72116	7898	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.524	838447	61	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	1187515	2606	185232	17204	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.429	1685671	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	13	48	2719511	6198	508668	26679	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

11 Table A5-9. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.765	372680	34	11	0.539	-2241	118802	-8	26	449	472489	1169	83423	11078	9
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.750	398999	31	11	0.539	-993	118802	4	15	213	515881	1263	91435	11882	7
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.723	335996	43	12	0.539	-3688	118802	2	26	213	417114	1079	79003	11428	9
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.712	338713	51	11	0.539	-4687	118802	4	26	213	399018	1053	74795	10359	9
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.696	709633	23	6	0.539	0	118802	2	15	213	892369	2053	148179	24503	7
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.694	720932	27	11	0.539	-969	118802	-8	26	449	862336	2108	150970	23705	9
5	PU2-NS-100	0.681	587968	23	15	0.539	0	118802	0	14	213	534276	1411	90492	22778	5
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.670	374760	56	13	0.539	-7433	118802	-8	27	449	452579	1203	86014	10934	9
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.669	315451	55	15	0.539	0	118802	0	14	213	218656	594	33080	14548	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.668	333352	53	15	0.539	0	118802	0	14	213	260290	705	40991	15513	5
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.657	770970	28	11	0.539	-704	118802	4	15	213	963370	2358	169765	24225	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.656	784779	29	11	0.539	-1635	118802	4	15	224	938474	2360	166340	22732	7
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.640	371052	64	13	0.539	-9458	118802	-8	27	449	449080	1200	85783	9972	9
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.627	1236296	23	11	0.539	-969	118802	-8	26	449	1407496	3190	223006	24728	9
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.624	1322954	17	6	0.539	0	118802	2	15	213	1472086	3283	227156	25526	7
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.622	1140593	30	11	0.539	-2241	118802	-8	26	449	1312660	2903	205079	22727	9
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.619	674492	49	13	0.539	-4392	118802	4	26	213	801289	2078	149141	21758	9
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.603	703021	53	13	0.539	-5323	118802	4	26	224	822379	2151	152348	20359	9
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.590	1270825	26	11	0.539	-993	118802	4	15	213	1481411	3334	236046	24302	7
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.588	1245782	29	11	0.539	-1635	118802	4	15	224	1410653	3208	225749	23755	7
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.588	1329816	23	11	0.539	-704	118802	4	15	213	1516824	3426	242008	25247	7
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.576	690931	62	13	0.539	-6787	118802	4	26	224	812285	2128	150663	19857	9
4	PU2-R3	0.572	1344531	18	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
3	PU2-R2	0.571	1344531	16	15	0.539	0	118802	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
2	PU2-R1	0.567	1344531	15	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.559	1186348	44	11	0.539	-4687	118802	4	26	213	1374289	3009	212997	23375	9
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.552	1316447	34	12	0.539	-3688	118802	2	26	213	1489662	3366	236543	25461	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.540	1286531	41	13	0.539	-4392	118802	4	26	213	1479947	3299	235022	24838	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.538	1207991	47	13	0.539	-5323	118802	4	26	224	1379131	3093	219611	23438	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.522	1175806	50	13	0.539	-7433	118802	-8	27	449	1373341	3066	218239	23175	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.509	1204194	55	13	0.539	-6787	118802	4	26	224	1375901	3082	218790	23376	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.489	1175279	58	13	0.539	-9458	118802	-8	27	449	1372408	3064	218011	23161	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.358	1974025	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	14	48	2991696	6875	556953	33981	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

12 Table A5-10. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.757	399768	34	11	0.535	-2241	107763	-8	26	449	486069	1196	86105	11166	9
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.741	423913	30	11	0.535	-993	107763	4	14	213	534811	1307	94920	11974	7
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.716	351195	42	12	0.535	-3688	107763	2	25	213	437880	1108	81850	11519	9
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.705	351847	50	11	0.535	-4687	107763	4	25	213	416170	1077	77096	10442	9
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.679	774064	23	6	0.535	0	107763	2	14	213	1016429	2250	167979	24742	7
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.675	800139	27	11	0.535	-969	107763	-8	26	449	975409	2351	172375	24045	9
5	PU2-NS-100	0.670	630117	22	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	617486	1529	102323	22875	5
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.665	320517	54	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	227009	605	34119	14618	5
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.663	390283	55	13	0.535	-7433	107763	-8	27	449	468145	1231	88749	11022	9
6	PU2-NS-400	0.662	344590	52	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	292390	754	45632	15585	5
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.641	837571	28	11	0.535	-1635	107763	4	14	224	1023440	2540	182220	23028	7
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.640	832900	27	11	0.535	-704	107763	4	14	213	1070988	2571	189249	24532	7
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.634	382756	63	13	0.535	-9458	107763	-8	27	449	465274	1221	87965	10058	9
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.612	1289766	23	11	0.535	-969	107763	-8	26	449	1475181	3365	238345	25089	9
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.610	1368367	16	6	0.535	0	107763	2	14	213	1549717	3401	240459	25785	7
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.610	1180869	30	11	0.535	-2241	107763	-8	26	449	1368039	3052	218215	23047	9
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.603	716654	48	13	0.535	-4392	107763	4	25	213	886583	2285	167415	22082	9
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.589	743749	53	13	0.535	-5323	107763	4	25	224	900066	2347	169590	20673	9
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.576	1314610	25	11	0.535	-993	107763	4	14	213	1548775	3495	250599	24630	7
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.574	1286650	28	11	0.535	-1635	107763	4	14	224	1467220	3358	239037	24071	7
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.573	1376248	23	11	0.535	-704	107763	4	14	213	1584189	3586	256562	25575	7
4	PU2-R3	0.564	1387351	18	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.562	727544	62	13	0.535	-6787	107763	4	26	224	883763	2313	167063	20169	9
2	PU2-R1	0.560	1387351	15	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
3	PU2-R2	0.559	1387351	16	15	0.539	0	105958	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.545	1230134	43	11	0.535	-4687	107763	4	25	213	1441653	3169	227550	23702	9
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.535	1370554	33	12	0.535	-3688	107763	2	25	213	1590375	3569	256690	25814	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.524	1337811	40	13	0.535	-4392	107763	4	25	213	1560048	3494	252743	25206	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.523	1254163	46	13	0.535	-5323	107763	4	25	224	1449299	3280	236166	23797	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.508	1221424	50	13	0.535	-7433	107763	-8	27	449	1442415	3252	234655	23522	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.494	1250356	55	13	0.535	-6787	107763	4	26	224	1446068	3268	235345	23735	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.476	1220896	57	13	0.535	-9458	107763	-8	27	449	1441482	3249	234428	23522	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.313	2143020	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	13	48	3349397	7832	642427	35319	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

13 Table A5-11. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.784	287314	34	11	0.535	-2241	106376	-8	26	449	386463	969	67270	8044	9
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.772	313731	29	11	0.535	-993	106376	4	15	213	425362	1070	75311	8898	7
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.744	267128	39	12	0.535	-3688	106376	2	26	213	347863	905	64857	9160	9
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.741	544133	21	6	0.535	0	106376	2	15	213	740241	1755	122965	18090	7
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.735	554313	27	11	0.535	-969	106376	-8	26	449	714540	1768	123461	17249	9
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.732	266405	48	11	0.535	-4687	106376	4	26	213	333238	886	61381	8317	9
5	PU2-NS-100	0.715	433278	20	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	524734	1511	92113	17007	5
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.703	605505	26	11	0.535	-704	106376	4	15	213	802174	2011	140839	17893	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.698	609790	28	11	0.535	-1635	106376	4	15	224	782509	2013	138089	16632	7
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.696	835849	23	11	0.535	-969	106376	-8	26	449	1167541	2592	177390	18170	9
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.694	912884	16	6	0.535	0	106376	2	15	213	1221997	2710	182786	19011	7
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.694	196586	50	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	260120	798	43721	11633	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.693	211596	48	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	296905	900	50727	12266	5
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.687	297750	55	13	0.535	-7433	106376	-8	27	449	377208	1007	70452	7916	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.687	766613	30	11	0.535	-2241	106376	-8	26	449	1078730	2342	162361	16562	9
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.659	913403	23	11	0.535	-704	106376	4	15	213	1256178	2794	193552	18814	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.657	884001	25	11	0.535	-993	106376	4	15	213	1225998	2731	189816	18215	7
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.657	536121	45	13	0.535	-4392	106376	4	26	213	674446	1763	123879	17254	9
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.655	858188	28	11	0.535	-1635	106376	4	15	224	1165009	2625	181171	17553	7
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.654	294965	63	13	0.535	-9458	106376	-8	27	449	374864	1005	70299	7847	9
4	PU2-R3	0.648	924948	18	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
3	PU2-R2	0.647	924948	16	15	0.539	0	118802	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
2	PU2-R1	0.643	924948	15	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.643	552034	50	13	0.535	-5323	106376	4	26	224	692947	1821	126260	16070	9
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.625	807240	43	11	0.535	-4687	106376	4	26	213	1130872	2425	168804	17353	9
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.622	910562	33	12	0.535	-3688	106376	2	26	213	1237129	2746	189138	18992	9
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.615	541929	58	13	0.535	-6787	106376	4	26	224	684698	1801	124835	15763	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.611	875459	40	13	0.535	-4392	106376	4	26	213	1220305	2654	185944	18406	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.605	823780	46	13	0.535	-5323	106376	4	26	224	1133873	2495	174206	17222	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.588	799671	50	13	0.535	-7433	106376	-8	27	449	1129344	2474	173124	16971	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.576	820239	54	13	0.535	-6787	106376	4	26	224	1130818	2484	173399	17162	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.555	799217	57	13	0.535	-9458	106376	-8	27	449	1128491	2471	172919	16958	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.461	1526056	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	14	48	2429045	5505	444675	25713	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

14 Table A5-12. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.782	300899	34	11	0.535	-2241	107763	-8	26	449	396431	984	68821	8096	9
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.769	330394	29	11	0.535	-993	107763	4	14	213	441889	1103	78087	8954	7
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.741	279047	39	12	0.535	-3688	107763	2	25	213	366890	931	67650	9227	9
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.730	591730	21	6	0.535	0	107763	2	14	213	845760	1914	139353	18286	7
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.729	276562	48	11	0.535	-4687	107763	4	25	213	348713	908	63653	8367	9
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.725	607363	27	11	0.535	-969	107763	-8	26	449	801614	1939	138347	17520	9
5	PU2-NS-100	0.710	460629	20	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	594596	1608	101892	17093	5
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.693	198833	50	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	267357	810	44766	11705	5
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.693	649261	26	11	0.535	-704	107763	4	14	213	885709	2163	155006	18110	7
6	PU2-NS-400	0.691	218006	48	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	326817	947	55291	12340	5
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.689	646630	28	11	0.535	-1635	107763	4	14	224	846825	2140	149497	16831	7
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.687	883061	23	11	0.535	-969	107763	-8	26	449	1223340	2723	189438	18456	9
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.686	309120	55	13	0.535	-7433	107763	-8	27	449	390796	1029	72647	7969	9
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.685	953438	16	6	0.535	0	107763	2	14	213	1292318	2811	194626	19221	7
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.681	800463	30	11	0.535	-2241	107763	-8	26	449	1123490	2449	172236	16776	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.653	304647	63	13	0.535	-9458	107763	-8	27	449	388792	1022	72116	7898	9
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.651	952833	23	11	0.535	-704	107763	4	14	213	1310737	2913	204747	19045	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.649	921798	25	11	0.535	-993	107763	4	14	213	1280557	2849	201011	18446	7
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.648	571766	45	13	0.535	-4392	107763	4	25	213	744669	1919	138039	17489	9
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.647	892455	28	11	0.535	-1635	107763	4	14	224	1210921	2734	191222	17668	7
4	PU2-R3	0.641	962540	18	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
2	PU2-R1	0.637	962540	15	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
3	PU2-R2	0.636	962540	16	15	0.539	0	105958	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.634	586486	50	13	0.535	-5323	107763	4	25	224	756434	1966	139482	16288	9
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.616	845037	43	11	0.535	-4687	107763	4	25	213	1185431	2544	179998	17584	9
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.611	959919	33	12	0.535	-3688	107763	2	25	213	1324351	2903	205626	19264	9
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.607	573892	59	13	0.535	-6787	107763	4	26	224	742626	1936	137216	15979	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.601	919823	40	13	0.535	-4392	107763	4	25	213	1285218	2799	199487	18667	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.595	863394	46	13	0.535	-5323	107763	4	25	224	1190830	2631	186696	17467	9
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.580	838901	50	13	0.535	-7433	107763	-8	27	449	1185242	2608	185437	17217	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.567	859853	55	13	0.535	-6787	107763	4	26	224	1187776	2620	185890	17406	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.548	838447	57	13	0.535	-9458	107763	-8	27	449	1187515	2606	185232	17204	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.424	1685671	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	13	48	2719511	6198	508668	26679	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

15 Table A5-13. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.850	338713	53	11	0.544	-4687	134483	4	26	213	399018	1053	74795	10359	9
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.840	335996	45	12	0.544	-3688	134483	2	26	213	417114	1079	79003	11428	9
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.819	398999	34	11	0.544	-993	134483	4	15	213	515881	1263	91435	11882	7
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.803	372680	37	11	0.544	-2241	134483	-8	26	449	472489	1169	83423	11078	9
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.754	315451	58	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	218656	594	33080	14548	5
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.751	674492	51	13	0.544	-4392	134483	4	26	213	801289	2078	149141	21758	9
6	PU2-NS-400	0.748	333352	55	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	260290	705	40991	15513	5
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.745	703021	56	13	0.544	-5323	134483	4	26	224	822379	2151	152348	20359	9
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.741	374760	58	13	0.544	-7433	134483	-8	27	449	452579	1203	86014	10934	9
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.738	709633	26	6	0.544	0	134483	2	15	213	892369	2053	148179	24503	7
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.730	690931	64	13	0.544	-6787	134483	4	26	224	812285	2128	150663	19857	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.723	371052	67	13	0.544	-9458	134483	-8	27	449	449080	1200	85783	9972	9
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.719	770970	31	11	0.544	-704	134483	4	15	213	963370	2358	169765	24225	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.719	784779	31	11	0.544	-1635	134483	4	15	224	938474	2360	166340	22732	7
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.717	720932	30	11	0.544	-969	134483	-8	26	449	862336	2108	150970	23705	9
5	PU2-NS-100	0.707	587968	25	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	534276	1411	90492	22778	5
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.702	1186348	46	11	0.544	-4687	134483	4	26	213	1374289	3009	212997	23375	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.685	1207991	50	13	0.544	-5323	134483	4	26	224	1379131	3093	219611	23438	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.681	1286531	43	13	0.544	-4392	134483	4	26	213	1479947	3299	235022	24838	9
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.679	1322954	19	6	0.544	0	134483	2	15	213	1472086	3283	227156	25526	7
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.675	1316447	37	12	0.544	-3688	134483	2	26	213	1489662	3366	236543	25461	9
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.670	1245782	31	11	0.544	-1635	134483	4	15	224	1410653	3208	225749	23755	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.670	1270825	28	11	0.544	-993	134483	4	15	213	1481411	3334	236046	24302	7
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.669	1140593	33	11	0.544	-2241	134483	-8	26	449	1312660	2903	205079	22727	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.668	1204194	57	13	0.544	-6787	134483	4	26	224	1375901	3082	218790	23376	9
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.665	1329816	26	11	0.544	-704	134483	4	15	213	1516824	3426	242008	25247	7
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.664	1236296	26	11	0.544	-969	134483	-8	26	449	1407496	3190	223006	24728	9
4	PU2-R3	0.614	1344531	18	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.600	1175806	53	13	0.544	-7433	134483	-8	27	449	1373341	3066	218239	23175	9
3	PU2-R2	0.597	1344531	16	15	0.539	0	118802	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
2	PU2-R1	0.583	1344531	15	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	1487852	3341	230244	25793	5
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.578	1175279	61	13	0.544	-9458	134483	-8	27	449	1372408	3064	218011	23161	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.279	1974025	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	14	48	2991696	6875	556953	33981	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

16 Table A5-14. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.844	351847	54	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	416170	1077	77096	10442	9
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.834	351195	45	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	437880	1108	81850	11519	9
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.813	423913	34	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	534811	1307	94920	11974	7
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.801	399768	37	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	486069	1196	86105	11166	9
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.754	320517	58	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	227009	605	34119	14618	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.747	344590	55	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	292390	754	45632	15585	5
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.740	390283	59	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	468145	1231	88749	11022	9
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.739	716654	51	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	886583	2285	167415	22082	9
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.733	743749	56	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	900066	2347	169590	20673	9
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.724	774064	26	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	1016429	2250	167979	24742	7
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.722	727544	65	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	883763	2313	167063	20169	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.722	382756	67	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	465274	1221	87965	10058	9
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.707	837571	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	1023440	2540	182220	23028	7
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.706	800139	30	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	975409	2351	172375	24045	9
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.706	832900	31	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	1070988	2571	189249	24532	7
5	PU2-NS-100	0.701	630120	25	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	617486	1529	102323	22875	5
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.690	1230134	47	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	1441653	3169	227550	23702	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.673	1254163	50	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	1449299	3280	236166	23797	9
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.669	1368367	19	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	1549717	3401	240459	25785	7
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.668	1337811	44	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	1560048	3494	252743	25206	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.663	1180869	33	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	1368039	3052	218215	23047	9
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.662	1370554	37	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	1590375	3569	256690	25814	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.660	1250356	58	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	1446068	3268	235345	23735	9
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.660	1286650	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	1467220	3358	239037	24071	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.659	1314610	28	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	1548775	3495	250599	24630	7
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.657	1289766	26	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	1475181	3365	238345	25089	9
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.653	1376248	26	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	1584189	3586	256562	25575	7
4	PU2-R3	0.609	1387351	18	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.593	1221424	53	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	1442415	3252	234655	23522	9
2	PU2-R1	0.578	1387351	15	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
3	PU2-R2	0.577	1387351	16	15	0.539	0	105958	0	14	213	1555941	3414	240117	26010	5
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.570	1220896	61	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	1441482	3249	234428	23522	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.238	2143020	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	13	48	3349397	7832	642427	35319	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

17 Table A5-15. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.838	266405	48	11	0.535	-4687	106376	4	26	213	333238	886	61381	8317	9
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.829	267128	39	12	0.535	-3688	106376	2	26	213	347863	905	64857	9160	9
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.813	313731	29	11	0.535	-993	106376	4	15	213	425362	1070	75311	8898	7
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.795	287314	34	11	0.535	-2241	106376	-8	26	449	386463	969	67270	8044	9
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.758	536121	45	13	0.535	-4392	106376	4	26	213	674446	1763	123879	17254	9
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.755	544133	21	6	0.535	0	106376	2	15	213	740241	1755	122965	18090	7
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.752	552034	50	13	0.535	-5323	106376	4	26	224	692947	1821	126260	16070	9
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.744	196586	50	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	260120	798	43721	11633	5
6	PU2-NS-400	0.739	211596	48	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	296905	900	50727	12266	5
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.737	605505	26	11	0.535	-704	106376	4	15	213	802174	2011	140839	17893	7
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.736	541929	58	13	0.535	-6787	106376	4	26	224	684698	1801	124835	15763	9
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.735	609790	28	11	0.535	-1635	106376	4	15	224	782509	2013	138089	16632	7
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.734	554313	27	11	0.535	-969	106376	-8	26	449	714540	1768	123461	17249	9
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.733	297750	55	13	0.535	-7433	106376	-8	27	449	377208	1007	70452	7916	9
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.733	807240	43	11	0.535	-4687	106376	4	26	213	1130872	2425	168804	17353	9
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.718	823780	46	13	0.535	-5323	106376	4	26	224	1133873	2495	174206	17222	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.717	875459	40	13	0.535	-4392	106376	4	26	213	1220305	2654	185944	18406	9
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.715	912884	16	6	0.535	0	106376	2	15	213	1221997	2710	182786	19011	7
5	PU2-NS-100	0.713	433278	20	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	524734	1511	92113	17007	5
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.711	910562	33	12	0.535	-3688	106376	2	26	213	1237129	2746	189138	18992	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.710	294965	63	13	0.535	-9458	106376	-8	27	449	374864	1005	70299	7847	9
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.703	858188	28	11	0.535	-1635	106376	4	15	224	1165009	2625	181171	17553	7
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.702	884001	25	11	0.535	-993	106376	4	15	213	1225998	2731	189816	18215	7
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.701	913403	23	11	0.535	-704	106376	4	15	213	1256178	2794	193552	18814	7
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.700	820239	54	13	0.535	-6787	106376	4	26	224	1130818	2484	173399	17162	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.700	766613	30	11	0.535	-2241	106376	-8	26	449	1078730	2342	162361	16562	9
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.700	835849	23	11	0.535	-969	106376	-8	26	449	1167541	2592	177390	18170	9
4	PU2-R3	0.682	924948	18	15	0.544	0	134483	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
3	PU2-R2	0.666	924948	16	15	0.539	0	118802	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
2	PU2-R1	0.651	924948	15	15	0.535	0	106376	0	14	213	1228445	2739	183304	19072	5
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.632	799671	50	13	0.535	-7433	106376	-8	27	449	1129344	2474	173124	16971	9
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.610	799217	57	13	0.535	-9458	106376	-8	27	449	1128491	2471	172919	16958	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.374	1526056	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	14	48	2429045	5505	444675	25713	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A5-16. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-2, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
33	PU2-C-R-400-3	0.864	276562	51	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	348713	908	63653	8367	9
32	PU2-C-WBI-400-1	0.855	279047	43	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	366890	931	67650	9227	9
31	PU2-C-R-100-3	0.839	330394	32	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	441889	1103	78087	8954	7
28	PU2-C-G-100-4	0.826	300899	37	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	396431	984	68821	8096	9
23	PU2-C-R-400-2	0.779	571766	49	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	744669	1919	138039	17489	9
21	PU2-C-WBI-100-1	0.775	591730	24	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	845760	1914	139353	18286	7
7	PU2-NS-1000	0.775	198833	53	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	267357	810	44766	11705	5
25	PU2-C-R-400-4	0.773	586486	54	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	756434	1966	139482	16288	9
6	PU2-NS-400	0.769	218006	52	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	326817	947	55291	12340	5
29	PU2-C-G-400-4	0.763	309120	59	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	390796	1029	72647	7969	9
26	PU2-C-R-1000-4	0.762	573892	62	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	742626	1936	137216	15979	9
27	PU2-C-G-100-1	0.758	607363	30	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	801614	1939	138347	17520	9
22	PU2-C-R-100-2	0.758	649261	29	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	885709	2163	155006	18110	7
24	PU2-C-R-100-4	0.757	646630	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	846825	2140	149497	16831	7
20	PU2-R-400-3	0.754	845037	47	11	0.544	-4687	135288	4	25	213	1185431	2544	179998	17584	9
30	PU2-C-G-1000-4	0.741	304647	67	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	388792	1022	72116	7898	9
5	PU2-NS-100	0.740	460629	24	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	594596	1608	101892	17093	5
12	PU2-R-400-4	0.739	863394	50	13	0.544	-5323	135288	4	25	224	1190830	2631	186696	17467	9
10	PU2-R-400-2	0.738	919823	44	13	0.544	-4392	135288	4	25	213	1285218	2799	199487	18667	9
8	PU2-WBI-100-1	0.736	953438	19	6	0.544	0	135288	2	14	213	1292318	2811	194626	19221	7
19	PU2-WBI-400-1	0.730	959919	37	12	0.544	-3688	135288	2	25	213	1324351	2903	205626	19264	9
15	PU2-G-100-4	0.727	800463	33	11	0.544	-2241	135288	-8	26	449	1123490	2449	172236	16776	9
17	PU2-R-1000-4	0.726	859853	58	13	0.544	-6787	135288	4	26	224	1187776	2620	185890	17406	9
11	PU2-R-100-4	0.726	892455	32	11	0.544	-1635	135288	4	14	224	1210921	2734	191222	17668	7
14	PU2-G-100-1	0.725	883061	26	11	0.544	-969	135288	-8	26	449	1223340	2723	189438	18456	9
18	PU2-R-100-3	0.724	921798	28	11	0.544	-993	135288	4	14	213	1280557	2849	201011	18446	7
9	PU2-R-100-2	0.723	952833	26	11	0.544	-704	135288	4	14	213	1310737	2913	204747	19045	7
4	PU2-R3	0.678	962540	18	15	0.544	0	135288	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
16	PU2-G-400-4	0.658	838901	53	13	0.544	-7433	135288	-8	27	449	1185242	2608	185437	17217	9
2	PU2-R1	0.647	962540	15	15	0.535	0	107763	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
3	PU2-R2	0.646	962540	16	15	0.539	0	105958	0	14	213	1292614	2810	192988	19257	5
13	PU2-G-1000-4	0.635	838447	61	13	0.544	-9458	135288	-8	27	449	1187515	2606	185232	17204	9

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

1	PU2-0	0.341	1685671	0	0	0.361	0	0	0	13	48	2719511	6198	508668	26679	2
---	-------	-------	---------	---	---	-------	---	---	---	----	----	---------	------	--------	-------	---

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Attachment 6 – Consumer Reports Analysis of Results – Planning Unit 3a

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-1. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.775	643686	38.24	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	603195	2564	124875	21582	0
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.769	676791	36.72	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	698195	2813	146620	23111	0
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.751	789368	33.26	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	1023795	3634	211446	25691	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.653	1939085	23.28	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	2685362	8103	529305	27563	0
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.618	881791	42.26	10	0.525	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	926775	3324	177871	13538	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.618	807255	45.97	10	0.525	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	850794	3115	164836	13526	1
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.612	814882	45.37	10	0.525	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	840810	3170	163942	13862	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.607	881666	44.69	10	0.525	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	905129	3372	176421	13873	1
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.584	790132	51.08	10	0.525	-5261	107662	-5	11	151	805950	3004	155275	13028	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.570	880259	48.49	10	0.525	-5621	107662	-5	11	151	921666	3304	176878	13423	1
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.557	769517	54.22	10	0.525	-6642	107662	-5	17	151	782227	2930	150364	12283	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.552	865411	50.91	10	0.525	-6642	107662	-5	17	151	903532	3243	173063	13258	1
1	PU3a-0	0.454	1967766	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	4	82	2719906	8201	537453	27726	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.404	1939085	22.77	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	2685362	8103	529305	27563	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-2. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.773	683990	38.66	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	654504	2713	138486	21964	0
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.764	743382	37.14	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	782915	3021	166349	23493	0
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.740	904566	33.68	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	1227878	4099	253446	26073	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.638	2085754	23.70	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	2908439	8745	583745	28305	0
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.607	836457	46.31	10	0.525	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	890989	3291	175024	13952	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.603	902202	45.63	10	0.525	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	948283	3478	185796	13964	1
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.593	914848	42.80	10	0.525	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	979878	3447	188915	13831	0
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.593	841620	46.51	10	0.525	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	911340	3254	177603	13819	0
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.581	819825	51.57	10	0.525	-5261	110019	-5	9	151	850432	3116	165494	13321	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.567	913315	48.98	10	0.525	-5621	110019	-5	9	151	974770	3428	187922	13716	1
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.556	795641	54.71	10	0.525	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	820602	3030	158846	12576	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.550	898468	51.40	10	0.525	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	956636	3366	184107	13551	1
1	PU3a-0	0.436	2111001	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	3	82	2954114	8880	592648	28407	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.340	2085754	23.19	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	2908439	8745	583745	28305	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-3. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.788	552202	37.99	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	558408	2259	107178	19126	0
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.783	576984	36.51	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	652165	2475	126081	20210	0
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.767	685804	33.13	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	940283	3233	184623	22474	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.687	1668415	23.28	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	2325161	7077	448282	23646	0
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.629	756869	42.26	10	0.525	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	859818	3056	162406	11864	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.628	689946	46.12	10	0.525	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	789520	2868	150180	11853	1
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.622	698350	45.36	10	0.525	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	782219	2929	149867	12227	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.619	757227	44.69	10	0.525	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	841837	3111	161580	12238	1
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.594	672680	51.12	10	0.525	-5261	107662	-5	11	151	744010	2758	140512	11358	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.582	754671	48.49	10	0.525	-5621	107662	-5	11	151	853718	3035	161296	11770	1
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.566	656044	54.29	10	0.525	-6642	107662	-5	16	151	723790	2694	136403	10708	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.562	743328	50.91	10	0.525	-6642	107662	-5	16	151	839314	2984	158340	11616	1
1	PU3a-0	0.489	1696830	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	4	82	2357177	7178	457070	23814	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.438	1668415	22.77	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	2325161	7077	448282	23646	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-4. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.787	586399	38.41	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	597149	2350	115365	19398	0
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.779	630615	36.93	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	740462	2670	145055	20483	0
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.758	782554	33.55	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	1098228	3626	220381	22746	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.674	1808767	23.70	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	2529886	7687	501446	24175	0
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.618	718550	46.30	10	0.525	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	831768	3047	161066	12294	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.614	776882	45.63	10	0.525	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	884852	3214	171086	12305	1
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.605	788669	42.80	10	0.525	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	913119	3177	173675	12083	0
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.604	722374	46.66	10	0.525	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	849686	3004	163155	12072	0
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.592	700897	51.61	10	0.525	-5261	110019	-5	9	151	787306	2867	150697	11577	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.579	786471	48.98	10	0.525	-5621	110019	-5	9	151	907019	3157	172565	11989	1
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.567	680701	54.78	10	0.525	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	760424	2789	144727	10928	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.562	775128	51.40	10	0.525	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	892615	3106	169609	11835	1
1	PU3a-0	0.471	1834666	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	3	82	2570608	7806	509770	24317	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.375	1808767	23.19	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	2529886	7687	501446	24175	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-5. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.853	643686	38.24	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	603195	2564	124875	21582	0
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.849	676791	36.72	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	698195	2813	146620	23111	0
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.838	789368	33.26	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	1023795	3634	211446	25691	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.795	1939085	23.28	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	2685362	8103	529305	27563	0
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.613	881791	42.26	10	0.525	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	926775	3324	177871	13538	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.612	807255	45.97	10	0.525	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	850794	3115	164836	13526	1
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.596	814882	45.37	10	0.525	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	840810	3170	163942	13862	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.594	881666	44.69	10	0.525	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	905129	3372	176421	13873	1
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.576	790132	51.08	10	0.525	-5261	107662	-5	11	151	805950	3004	155275	13028	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.563	880259	48.49	10	0.525	-5621	107662	-5	11	151	921666	3304	176878	13423	1
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.538	769517	54.22	10	0.525	-6642	107662	-5	17	151	782227	2930	150364	12283	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.535	865411	50.91	10	0.525	-6642	107662	-5	17	151	903532	3243	173063	13258	1
3	PU3a-R2	0.483	1939085	22.77	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	2685362	8103	529305	27563	0
1	PU3a-0	0.465	1967766	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	4	82	2719906	8201	537453	27726	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-6. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.856	683990	38.66	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	654504	2713	138486	21964	0
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.851	743382	37.14	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	782915	3021	166349	23493	0
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.837	904566	33.68	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	1227878	4099	253446	26073	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.792	2085754	23.70	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	2908439	8745	583745	28305	0
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.598	836457	46.31	10	0.525	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	890989	3291	175024	13952	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.596	902202	45.63	10	0.525	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	948283	3478	185796	13964	1
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.594	914848	42.80	10	0.525	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	979878	3447	188915	13831	0
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.593	841620	46.51	10	0.525	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	911340	3254	177603	13819	0
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.578	819825	51.57	10	0.525	-5261	110019	-5	9	151	850432	3116	165494	13321	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.565	913315	48.98	10	0.525	-5621	110019	-5	9	151	974770	3428	187922	13716	1
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.541	795641	54.71	10	0.525	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	820602	3030	158846	12576	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.538	898468	51.40	10	0.525	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	956636	3366	184107	13551	1
1	PU3a-0	0.455	2111001	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	3	82	2954114	8880	592648	28407	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.408	2085754	23.19	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	2908439	8745	583745	28305	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-7. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.862	552202	37.99	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	558408	2259	107178	19126	0
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.859	576984	36.51	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	652165	2475	126081	20210	0
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.850	685804	33.13	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	940283	3233	184623	22474	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.816	1668415	23.28	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	2325161	7077	448282	23646	0
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.620	756869	42.26	10	0.525	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	859818	3056	162406	11864	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.618	689946	46.12	10	0.525	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	789520	2868	150180	11853	1
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.603	698350	45.36	10	0.525	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	782219	2929	149867	12227	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.601	757227	44.69	10	0.525	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	841837	3111	161580	12238	1
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.582	672680	51.12	10	0.525	-5261	107662	-5	11	151	744010	2758	140512	11358	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.570	754671	48.49	10	0.525	-5621	107662	-5	11	151	853718	3035	161296	11770	1
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.544	656044	54.29	10	0.525	-6642	107662	-5	16	151	723790	2694	136403	10708	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.542	743328	50.91	10	0.525	-6642	107662	-5	16	151	839314	2984	158340	11616	1
3	PU3a-R2	0.503	1668415	22.77	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	2325161	7077	448282	23646	0
1	PU3a-0	0.485	1696830	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	4	82	2357177	7178	457070	23814	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-8. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.865	586399	38.41	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	597149	2350	115365	19398	0
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.861	630615	36.93	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	740462	2670	145055	20483	0
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.850	782554	33.55	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	1098228	3626	220381	22746	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.813	1808767	23.70	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	2529886	7687	501446	24175	0
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.604	718550	46.30	10	0.525	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	831768	3047	161066	12294	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.603	776882	45.63	10	0.525	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	884852	3214	171086	12305	1
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.601	788669	42.80	10	0.525	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	913119	3177	173675	12083	0
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.600	722374	46.66	10	0.525	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	849686	3004	163155	12072	0
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.585	700897	51.61	10	0.525	-5261	110019	-5	9	151	787306	2867	150697	11577	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.572	786471	48.98	10	0.525	-5621	110019	-5	9	151	907019	3157	172565	11989	1
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.548	680701	54.78	10	0.525	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	760424	2789	144727	10928	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.545	775128	51.40	10	0.525	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	892615	3106	169609	11835	1
1	PU3a-0	0.476	1834666	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	3	82	2570608	7806	509770	24317	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.429	1808767	23.19	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	2529886	7687	501446	24175	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-9. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.580	814882	44.86	10	0.345	-4880	29332	-5	17	180	840810	3170	163942	13862	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.569	881666	44.18	10	0.345	-4880	29332	-5	17	180	905129	3372	176421	13873	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.556	807255	45.46	10	0.345	-4201	29332	-5	14	151	850794	3115	164836	13526	1
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.553	881791	41.75	10	0.345	-4201	29332	-5	14	151	926775	3324	177871	13538	1
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.548	643686	37.73	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	603195	2564	124875	21582	0
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.535	790132	50.57	10	0.345	-5261	29332	-5	11	151	805950	3004	155275	13028	1
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.534	676791	36.21	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	698195	2813	146620	23111	0
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.529	769517	53.71	10	0.345	-6642	29332	-5	17	151	782227	2930	150364	12283	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.518	880259	47.98	10	0.345	-5621	29332	-5	11	151	921666	3304	176878	13423	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.515	865411	50.40	10	0.345	-6642	29332	-5	17	151	903532	3243	173063	13258	1
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.496	789368	32.75	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	1023795	3634	211446	25691	0
1	PU3a-0	0.370	1967766	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	4	82	2719906	8201	537453	27726	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.347	1939085	23.28	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	2685362	8103	529305	27563	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.263	1939085	22.77	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	2685362	8103	529305	27563	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-10. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.555	836457	45.80	10	0.345	-4880	4349	-5	14	180	890989	3291	175024	13952	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.545	902202	45.12	10	0.345	-4880	4349	-5	14	180	948283	3478	185796	13964	1
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.523	683990	38.15	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	654504	2713	138486	21964	0
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.511	819825	51.06	10	0.345	-5261	4349	-5	9	151	850432	3116	165494	13321	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.509	841620	46.00	10	0.345	-4201	4349	-5	11	151	911340	3254	177603	13819	0
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.508	795641	54.20	10	0.345	-6642	4349	-5	16	151	820602	3030	158846	12576	1
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.507	914848	42.29	10	0.345	-4201	4349	-5	11	151	979878	3447	188915	13831	0
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.504	743381	36.63	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	782915	3021	166349	23493	0
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.494	913315	48.47	10	0.345	-5621	4349	-5	9	151	974770	3428	187922	13716	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.491	898468	50.89	10	0.345	-6642	4349	-5	16	151	956636	3366	184107	13551	1
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.453	904566	33.17	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	1227878	4099	253446	26073	0
1	PU3a-0	0.330	2111001	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	3	82	2954114	8880	592648	28407	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.307	2085754	23.70	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	2908439	8745	583745	28305	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.210	2085754	23.19	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	2908439	8745	583745	28305	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-11. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.606	698350	44.85	10	0.345	-4880	29332	-5	17	180	782219	2929	149867	12227	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.597	757227	44.18	10	0.345	-4880	29332	-5	17	180	841837	3111	161580	12238	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.582	689946	45.61	10	0.345	-4201	29332	-5	14	151	789520	2868	150180	11853	1
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.581	756869	41.75	10	0.345	-4201	29332	-5	14	151	859818	3056	162406	11864	1
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.576	552202	37.48	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	558408	2259	107178	19126	0
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.566	576984	36.00	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	652165	2475	126081	20210	0
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.561	672680	50.61	10	0.345	-5261	29332	-5	11	151	744010	2758	140512	11358	1
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.553	656044	53.78	10	0.345	-6642	29332	-5	16	151	723790	2694	136403	10708	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.547	754671	47.98	10	0.345	-5621	29332	-5	11	151	853718	3035	161296	11770	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.541	743328	50.40	10	0.345	-6642	29332	-5	16	151	839314	2984	158340	11616	1
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.532	685804	32.62	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	940283	3233	184623	22474	0
1	PU3a-0	0.447	1696830	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	4	82	2357177	7178	457070	23814	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.424	1668415	23.28	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	2325161	7077	448282	23646	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.340	1668415	22.77	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	2325161	7077	448282	23646	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-12. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.582	718550	45.79	10	0.345	-4880	4349	-5	14	180	831768	3047	161066	12294	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.573	776882	45.12	10	0.345	-4880	4349	-5	14	180	884852	3214	171086	12305	1
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.554	586399	37.90	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	597149	2350	115365	19398	0
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.539	630615	36.42	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	740462	2670	145055	20483	0
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.538	700897	51.10	10	0.345	-5261	4349	-5	9	151	787306	2867	150697	11577	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.536	722374	46.15	10	0.345	-4201	4349	-5	11	151	849686	3004	163155	12072	0
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.535	788669	42.29	10	0.345	-4201	4349	-5	11	151	913119	3177	173675	12083	0
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.534	680701	54.27	10	0.345	-6642	4349	-5	16	151	760424	2789	144727	10928	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.522	786471	48.47	10	0.345	-5621	4349	-5	9	151	907019	3157	172565	11989	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.519	775128	50.89	10	0.345	-6642	4349	-5	16	151	892615	3106	169609	11835	1
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.494	782554	33.04	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	1098228	3626	220381	22746	0
1	PU3a-0	0.410	1834666	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	3	82	2570608	7806	509770	24317	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.387	1808767	23.70	15	0.525	0	110019	0	3	82	2529886	7687	501446	24175	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.290	1808767	23.19	15	0.345	0	4349	0	3	82	2529886	7687	501446	24175	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-13. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.717	814882	45.37	10	0.525	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	840810	3170	163942	13862	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.708	881666	44.69	10	0.525	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	905129	3372	176421	13873	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.706	807255	45.97	10	0.525	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	850794	3115	164836	13526	1
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.699	881791	42.26	10	0.525	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	926775	3324	177871	13538	1
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.697	769517	54.22	10	0.525	-6642	107662	-5	17	151	782227	2930	150364	12283	1
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.694	643686	38.24	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	603195	2564	124875	21582	0
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.683	790132	51.08	10	0.525	-5261	107662	-5	11	151	805950	3004	155275	13028	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.680	865411	50.91	10	0.525	-6642	107662	-5	17	151	903532	3243	173063	13258	1
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.676	676791	36.72	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	698195	2813	146620	23111	0
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.665	880259	48.49	10	0.525	-5621	107662	-5	11	151	921666	3304	176878	13423	1
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.633	789368	33.26	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	1023795	3634	211446	25691	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.443	1939085	23.28	15	0.525	0	107662	0	4	82	2685362	8103	529305	27563	0
1	PU3a-0	0.303	1967766	0.00	0	0.345	0	0	0	4	82	2719906	8201	537453	27726	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.278	1939085	22.77	15	0.345	0	29332	0	4	82	2685362	8103	529305	27563	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-14. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.701	836457	46.31	10	1	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	890989	3291	175024	13952	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.693	902202	45.63	10	1	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	948283	3478	185796	13964	1
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.690	795641	54.71	10	1	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	820602	3030	158846	12576	1
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.683	683990	38.66	15	1	0	110019	0	3	82	654504	2713	138486	21964	0
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.671	898468	51.40	10	1	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	956636	3366	184107	13551	1
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.670	819825	51.57	10	1	-5261	110019	-5	9	151	850432	3116	165494	13321	1
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.662	743382	37.14	15	1	0	110019	0	3	82	782915	3021	166349	23493	0
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.652	913315	48.98	10	1	-5621	110019	-5	9	151	974770	3428	187922	13716	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.638	841620	46.51	10	1	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	911340	3254	177603	13819	0
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.632	914848	42.80	10	1	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	979878	3447	188915	13831	0
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.608	904566	33.68	15	1	0	110019	0	3	82	1227878	4099	253446	26073	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.410	2085754	23.70	15	1	0	110019	0	3	82	2908439	8745	583745	28305	0
1	PU3a-0	0.267	2111001	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	3	82	2954114	8880	592648	28407	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.208	2085754	23.19	15	0	0	4349	0	3	82	2908439	8745	583745	28305	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-15. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.740	698350	45.36	10	1	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	782219	2929	149867	12227	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.733	757227	44.69	10	1	-4880	107662	-5	17	180	841837	3111	161580	12238	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.729	689946	46.12	10	1	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	789520	2868	150180	11853	1
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.724	756869	42.26	10	1	-4201	107662	-5	14	151	859818	3056	162406	11864	1
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.722	552202	37.99	15	1	0	107662	0	4	82	558408	2259	107178	19126	0
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.716	656044	54.29	10	1	-6642	107662	-5	16	151	723790	2694	136403	10708	1
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.708	576984	36.51	15	1	0	107662	0	4	82	652165	2475	126081	20210	0
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.707	672680	51.12	10	1	-5261	107662	-5	11	151	744010	2758	140512	11358	1
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.700	743328	50.91	10	1	-6642	107662	-5	16	151	839314	2984	158340	11616	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.690	754671	48.49	10	1	-5621	107662	-5	11	151	853718	3035	161296	11770	1
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.669	685804	33.13	15	1	0	107662	0	4	82	940283	3233	184623	22474	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.513	1668415	23.28	15	1	0	107662	0	4	82	2325161	7077	448282	23646	0
1	PU3a-0	0.373	1696830	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	4	82	2357177	7178	457070	23814	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.348	1668415	22.77	15	0	0	29332	0	4	82	2325161	7077	448282	23646	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report

DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A6-16. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3a, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7	PU3a-C-M-100-1	0.725	718550	46.30	10	1	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	831768	3047	161066	12294	1
11	PU3a-M-100-1	0.718	776882	45.63	10	1	-4880	110019	-5	14	180	884852	3214	171086	12305	1
6	PU3a-NS-1000	0.714	586399	38.41	15	1	0	110019	0	3	82	597149	2350	115365	19398	0
10	PU3a-C-G-1000-2	0.713	680701	54.78	10	1	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	760424	2789	144727	10928	1
5	PU3a-NS-400	0.696	630615	36.93	15	1	0	110019	0	3	82	740462	2670	145055	20483	0
14	PU3a-G-1000-2	0.695	775128	51.40	10	1	-6642	110019	-5	16	151	892615	3106	169609	11835	1
9	PU3a-C-G-400-2	0.695	700897	51.61	10	1	-5261	110019	-5	9	151	787306	2867	150697	11577	1
13	PU3a-G-400-2	0.677	786471	48.98	10	1	-5621	110019	-5	9	151	907019	3157	172565	11989	1
8	PU3a-C-M-100-2	0.662	722374	46.66	10	1	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	849686	3004	163155	12072	0
12	PU3a-M-100-2	0.657	788669	42.80	10	1	-4201	110019	-5	11	151	913119	3177	173675	12083	0
4	PU3a-NS-100	0.649	782554	33.55	15	1	0	110019	0	3	82	1098228	3626	220381	22746	0
2	PU3a-R1	0.483	1808767	23.70	15	1	0	110019	0	3	82	2529886	7687	501446	24175	0
1	PU3a-0	0.340	1834666	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	3	82	2570608	7806	509770	24317	0
3	PU3a-R2	0.281	1808767	23.19	15	0	0	4349	0	3	82	2529886	7687	501446	24175	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Attachment 7 – Consumer Reports Analysis of Results – Planning Unit 3b

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-1. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.812	200548	16	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	174969	677	37504	3171	3
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.770	204497	23	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	175916	677	36927	3230	3
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.763	274798	17	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	290829	1087	61230	5939	3
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.746	193466	11	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	145125	674	30583	7521	1
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.743	204607	9	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	157726	707	33085	8060	1
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.742	253136	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	227178	943	48988	4254	3
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.735	296219	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	243895	1025	52727	4345	3
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.725	257848	24	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	271961	1026	56062	5935	3
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.724	257260	8	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	259937	998	54656	8116	1
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.678	259779	29	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	237719	988	51255	4416	5
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.668	308987	28	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	259191	1087	56159	4567	5
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.651	237237	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	261011	964	52031	3705	5
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.649	171421	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	151826	642	33794	2603	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.647	257612	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	275373	1022	55199	3741	5
2	PU3b-R1	0.627	590758	5	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	636916	2174	133961	8799	1
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.600	284385	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	265460	1088	57142	4745	5
1	PU3b-0	0.431	614250	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	10	17	661954	2239	140698	8970	1

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-2. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.839	212084	16	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	183338	700	39548	3299	1
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.805	216530	23	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	184898	701	39110	3359	3
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.785	301872	17	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	312057	1140	66309	6196	1
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.773	199124	11	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	148994	682	31394	7833	0
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.771	264049	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	251582	990	53976	4354	2
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.769	215192	9	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	168706	735	35775	8372	0
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.764	306246	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	266161	1067	57221	4444	2
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.758	273975	24	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	284926	1057	59024	6199	3
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.740	297974	8	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	314912	1128	67471	8428	0
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.711	270431	29	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	256883	1020	54715	4535	5
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.701	320853	28	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	282680	1132	60963	4686	5
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.684	245729	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	272769	987	54351	3795	5
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.684	178712	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	162680	665	36028	2666	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.680	266202	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	286353	1043	57325	3831	5
2	PU3b-R1	0.637	648569	5	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	696591	2329	148579	9405	0
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.633	296918	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	286452	1126	61075	4885	5
1	PU3b-0	0.404	669205	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	8	17	724368	2385	154636	9541	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-3. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.814	180389	16	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	192143	691	39763	2942	3
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.772	184613	23	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	192316	687	38762	2998	3
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.765	256368	17	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	318850	1104	64510	5490	3
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.749	182108	11	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	147067	654	29891	7184	1
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.747	192542	10	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	161090	687	32518	7639	1
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.746	236242	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	237095	932	49567	3964	3
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.738	275790	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	253458	1010	53195	4051	3
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.728	240694	8	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	275491	975	54909	7649	1
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.727	244033	25	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	297208	1038	58651	5529	3
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.681	242995	29	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	248347	981	51926	4166	5
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.672	288184	28	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	269836	1074	56786	4264	5
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.653	221962	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	274619	957	53153	3476	5
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.650	159727	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	159936	644	34811	2436	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.649	242232	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	289044	1013	56324	3511	5
2	PU3b-R1	0.625	552890	5	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	715261	2266	145427	8260	1
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.603	265965	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	279017	1084	58209	4475	5
1	PU3b-0	0.431	571661	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	10	17	735688	2310	149705	8407	1

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-4. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.841	189711	16	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	199338	707	41031	3041	1
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.808	194446	23	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	200128	704	40126	3099	3
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.788	278281	17	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	339134	1149	68608	5726	1
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.776	186872	11	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	151507	662	30788	7487	0
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.775	245789	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	261372	967	53363	4051	2
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.773	201866	10	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	172723	715	35249	7942	0
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.768	284516	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	275220	1039	56407	4138	2
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.760	257442	25	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	310546	1067	61281	5773	3
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.744	277457	8	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	337660	1111	68145	7952	0
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.714	252402	29	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	270828	1013	55401	4273	5
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.705	298517	28	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	293066	1108	60375	4371	5
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.686	229599	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	288284	981	55554	3563	5
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.686	166184	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	170360	659	36241	2487	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.682	249958	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	301780	1035	58494	3599	5
2	PU3b-R1	0.637	603619	5	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	775225	2405	157929	8849	0
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.636	276998	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	303332	1121	62132	4603	5
1	PU3b-0	0.405	619625	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	8	17	802390	2451	162913	8960	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-5. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.840	200548	16	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	174969	677	37504	3171	3
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.808	274798	17	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	290829	1087	61230	5939	3
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.800	204497	23	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	175916	677	36927	3230	3
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.773	193466	11	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	145125	674	30583	7521	1
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.770	204607	9	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	157726	707	33085	8060	1
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.770	257848	24	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	271961	1026	56062	5935	3
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.767	253136	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	227178	943	48988	4254	3
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.764	296219	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	243895	1025	52727	4345	3
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.762	257260	8	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	259937	998	54656	8116	1
2	PU3b-R1	0.717	590758	5	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	636916	2174	133961	8799	1
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.704	259779	29	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	237719	988	51255	4416	5
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.700	308987	28	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	259191	1087	56159	4567	5
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.662	171421	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	151826	642	33794	2603	5
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.633	284385	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	265460	1088	57142	4745	5
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.622	237237	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	261011	964	52031	3705	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.620	257612	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	275373	1022	55199	3741	5
1	PU3b-0	0.419	614250	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	10	17	661954	2239	140698	8970	1

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-6. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.886	212084	16	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	183338	700	39548	3299	1
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.853	216530	23	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	184898	701	39110	3359	3
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.851	301872	17	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	312057	1140	66309	6196	1
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.822	273975	24	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	284926	1057	59024	6199	3
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.820	199124	11	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	148994	682	31394	7833	0
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.816	215192	9	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	168706	735	35775	8372	0
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.816	264049	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	251582	990	53976	4354	2
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.813	306246	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	266161	1067	57221	4444	2
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.804	297974	8	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	314912	1128	67471	8428	0
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.757	270431	29	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	256883	1020	54715	4535	5
2	PU3b-R1	0.756	648569	5	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	696591	2329	148579	9405	0
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.752	320853	28	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	282680	1132	60963	4686	5
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.716	178712	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	162680	665	36028	2666	5
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.686	296918	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	286452	1126	61075	4885	5
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.675	245729	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	272769	987	54351	3795	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.673	266202	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	286353	1043	57325	3831	5
1	PU3b-0	0.402	669205	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	8	17	724368	2385	154636	9541	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-7. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.842	180389	16	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	192143	691	39763	2942	3
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.810	256368	17	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	318850	1104	64510	5490	3
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.802	184613	23	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	192316	687	38762	2998	3
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.775	182108	11	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	147067	654	29891	7184	1
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.773	192542	10	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	161090	687	32518	7639	1
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.772	244033	25	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	297208	1038	58651	5529	3
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.770	236242	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	237095	932	49567	3964	3
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.766	275790	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	253458	1010	53195	4051	3
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.766	240694	8	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	275491	975	54909	7649	1
2	PU3b-R1	0.719	552890	5	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	715261	2266	145427	8260	1
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.706	242995	29	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	248347	981	51926	4166	5
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.702	288184	28	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	269836	1074	56786	4264	5
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.664	159727	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	159936	644	34811	2436	5
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.635	265965	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	279017	1084	58209	4475	5
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.624	221962	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	274619	957	53153	3476	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.622	242232	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	289044	1013	56324	3511	5
1	PU3b-0	0.421	571661	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	10	17	735688	2310	149705	8407	1

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-8. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.888	189711	16	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	199338	707	41031	3041	1
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.856	194446	23	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	200128	704	40126	3099	3
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.854	278281	17	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	339134	1149	68608	5726	1
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.824	257442	25	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	310546	1067	61281	5773	3
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.823	186872	11	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	151507	662	30788	7487	0
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.820	201866	10	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	172723	715	35249	7942	0
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.819	245789	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	261372	967	53363	4051	2
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.816	284516	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	275220	1039	56407	4138	2
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.807	277457	8	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	337660	1111	68145	7952	0
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.759	252402	29	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	270828	1013	55401	4273	5
2	PU3b-R1	0.758	603619	5	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	775225	2405	157929	8849	0
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.755	298517	28	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	293066	1108	60375	4371	5
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.718	166184	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	170360	659	36241	2487	5
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.688	276998	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	303332	1121	62132	4603	5
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.677	229599	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	288284	981	55554	3563	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.675	249958	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	301780	1035	58494	3599	5
1	PU3b-0	0.405	619625	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	8	17	802390	2451	162913	8960	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-9. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.791	200548	16	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	174969	677	37504	3171	3
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.751	204497	23	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	175916	677	36927	3230	3
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.731	237237	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	261011	964	52031	3705	5
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.724	253136	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	227178	943	48988	4254	3
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.719	257612	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	275373	1022	55199	3741	5
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.702	296219	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	243895	1025	52727	4345	3
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.694	171421	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	151826	642	33794	2603	5
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.687	274798	17	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	290829	1087	61230	5939	3
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.684	193466	11	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	145125	674	30583	7521	1
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.677	204607	9	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	157726	707	33085	8060	1
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.664	259779	29	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	237719	988	51255	4416	5
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.659	257848	24	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	271961	1026	56062	5935	3
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.639	308987	28	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	259191	1087	56159	4567	5
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.636	257260	8	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	259937	998	54656	8116	1
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.585	284385	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	265460	1088	57142	4745	5
2	PU3b-R1	0.406	590758	5	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	636916	2174	133961	8799	1
1	PU3b-0	0.378	614250	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	10	17	661954	2239	140698	8970	1

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-10. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.784	212084	16	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	183338	700	39548	3299	1
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.752	216530	23	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	184898	701	39110	3359	3
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.731	245729	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	272769	987	54351	3795	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.719	266202	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	286353	1043	57325	3831	5
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.718	264049	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	251582	990	53976	4354	2
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.697	178712	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	162680	665	36028	2666	5
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.697	306246	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	266161	1067	57221	4444	2
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.679	199124	11	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	148994	682	31394	7833	0
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.669	301872	17	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	312057	1140	66309	6196	1
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.667	215192	9	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	168706	735	35775	8372	0
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.663	270431	29	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	256883	1020	54715	4535	5
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.655	273975	24	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	284926	1057	59024	6199	3
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.635	320853	28	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	282680	1132	60963	4686	5
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.604	297974	8	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	314912	1128	67471	8428	0
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.584	296918	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	286452	1126	61075	4885	5
2	PU3b-R1	0.361	648569	5	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	696591	2329	148579	9405	0
1	PU3b-0	0.326	669205	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	8	17	724368	2385	154636	9541	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-11. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.798	180389	16	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	192143	691	39763	2942	3
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.759	184613	23	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	192316	687	38762	2998	3
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.738	221962	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	274619	957	53153	3476	5
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.733	236242	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	237095	932	49567	3964	3
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.726	242232	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	289044	1013	56324	3511	5
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.713	275790	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	253458	1010	53195	4051	3
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.699	159727	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	159936	644	34811	2436	5
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.695	256368	17	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	318850	1104	64510	5490	3
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.693	182108	11	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	147067	654	29891	7184	1
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.687	192542	10	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	161090	687	32518	7639	1
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.673	242995	29	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	248347	981	51926	4166	5
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.665	244033	25	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	297208	1038	58651	5529	3
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.650	288184	28	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	269836	1074	56786	4264	5
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.647	240694	8	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	275491	975	54909	7649	1
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.594	265965	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	279017	1084	58209	4475	5
2	PU3b-R1	0.412	552890	5	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	715261	2266	145427	8260	1
1	PU3b-0	0.389	571661	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	10	17	735688	2310	149705	8407	1

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-12. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.793	189711	16	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	199338	707	41031	3041	1
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.761	194446	23	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	200128	704	40126	3099	3
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.738	229599	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	288284	981	55554	3563	5
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.729	245789	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	261372	967	53363	4051	2
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.727	249958	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	301780	1035	58494	3599	5
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.710	284516	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	275220	1039	56407	4138	2
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.704	166184	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	170360	659	36241	2487	5
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.688	186872	11	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	151507	662	30788	7487	0
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.680	278281	17	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	339134	1149	68608	5726	1
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.678	201866	10	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	172723	715	35249	7942	0
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.672	252402	29	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	270828	1013	55401	4273	5
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.663	257442	25	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	310546	1067	61281	5773	3
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.648	298517	28	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	293066	1108	60375	4371	5
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.615	277457	8	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	337660	1111	68145	7952	0
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.593	276998	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	303332	1121	62132	4603	5
2	PU3b-R1	0.372	603619	5	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	775225	2405	157929	8849	0
1	PU3b-0	0.339	619625	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	8	17	802390	2451	162913	8960	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-13. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.824	200548	16	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	174969	677	37504	3171	3
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.817	204497	23	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	175916	677	36927	3230	3
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.802	171421	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	151826	642	33794	2603	5
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.767	253136	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	227178	943	48988	4254	3
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.760	259779	29	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	237719	988	51255	4416	5
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.752	296219	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	243895	1025	52727	4345	3
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.742	237237	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	261011	964	52031	3705	5
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.740	308987	28	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	259191	1087	56159	4567	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.733	257612	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	275373	1022	55199	3741	5
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.724	257848	24	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	271961	1026	56062	5935	3
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.721	274798	17	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	290829	1087	61230	5939	3
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.703	284385	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	265460	1088	57142	4745	5
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.677	193466	11	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	145125	674	30583	7521	1
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.663	204607	9	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	157726	707	33085	8060	1
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.627	257260	8	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	259937	998	54656	8116	1
2	PU3b-R1	0.447	590758	5	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	636916	2174	133961	8799	1
1	PU3b-0	0.308	614250	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	10	17	661954	2239	140698	8970	1

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-14. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.839	216530	23	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	184898	701	39110	3359	3
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.826	212084	16	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	183338	700	39548	3299	1
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.826	178712	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	162680	665	36028	2666	5
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.779	270431	29	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	256883	1020	54715	4535	5
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.776	264049	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	251582	990	53976	4354	2
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.761	306246	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	266161	1067	57221	4444	2
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.759	245729	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	272769	987	54351	3795	5
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.758	320853	28	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	282680	1132	60963	4686	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.750	266202	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	286353	1043	57325	3831	5
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.741	273975	24	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	284926	1057	59024	6199	3
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.722	296918	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	286452	1126	61075	4885	5
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.714	301872	17	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	312057	1140	66309	6196	1
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.676	199124	11	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	148994	682	31394	7833	0
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.660	215192	9	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	168706	735	35775	8372	0
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.606	297974	8	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	314912	1128	67471	8428	0
2	PU3b-R1	0.415	648569	5	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	696591	2329	148579	9405	0
1	PU3b-0	0.249	669205	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	8	17	724368	2385	154636	9541	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-15. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.830	180389	16	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	192143	691	39763	2942	3
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.824	184613	23	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	192316	687	38762	2998	3
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.807	159727	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	159936	644	34811	2436	5
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.776	236242	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	237095	932	49567	3964	3
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.767	242995	29	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	248347	981	51926	4166	5
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.761	275790	19	10	0.505	-2466	50027	4	15	178	253458	1010	53195	4051	3
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.750	288184	28	12	0.505	-3878	50027	4	19	178	269836	1074	56786	4264	5
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.748	221962	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	274619	957	53153	3476	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.739	242232	20	10	0.505	-2296	50027	-8	19	288	289044	1013	56324	3511	5
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.731	244033	25	12	0.505	-1702	50027	4	16	147	297208	1038	58651	5529	3
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.729	256368	17	10	0.505	-940	50027	4	12	147	318850	1104	64510	5490	3
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.711	265965	36	14	0.505	-5188	50027	4	19	178	279017	1084	58209	4475	5
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.686	182108	11	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	147067	654	29891	7184	1
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.674	192542	10	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	161090	687	32518	7639	1
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.638	240694	8	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	275491	975	54909	7649	1
2	PU3b-R1	0.451	552890	5	15	0.505	0	50027	0	10	17	715261	2266	145427	8260	1
1	PU3b-0	0.316	571661	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	10	17	735688	2310	149705	8407	1

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A7-16. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-3b, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
17	PU3b-RL-400-1	0.846	194446	23	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	200128	704	40126	3099	3
16	PU3b-RL-100-1	0.834	189711	16	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	199338	707	41031	3041	1
15	PU3b-F-1000-1	0.831	166184	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	170360	659	36241	2487	5
8	PU3b-C-F-400-1	0.787	252402	29	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	270828	1013	55401	4273	5
7	PU3b-C-F-100-1	0.786	245789	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	261372	967	53363	4051	2
13	PU3b-F-100-1	0.772	284516	19	10	0.505	-2466	62021	4	15	178	275220	1039	56407	4138	2
14	PU3b-F-400-1	0.769	298517	28	12	0.505	-3878	62021	4	19	178	293066	1108	60375	4371	5
6	PU3b-C-G-100-1	0.765	229599	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	288284	981	55554	3563	5
12	PU3b-G-100-1	0.757	249958	20	10	0.505	-2296	62021	-8	18	288	301780	1035	58494	3599	5
11	PU3b-C-RL-400-1	0.749	257442	25	12	0.505	-1702	62021	4	16	147	310546	1067	61281	5773	3
9	PU3b-C-F-1000-1	0.730	276998	36	14	0.505	-5188	62021	4	19	178	303332	1121	62132	4603	5
10	PU3b-C-RL-100-1	0.724	278281	17	10	0.505	-940	62021	4	12	147	339134	1149	68608	5726	1
5	PU3b-NS-1000	0.686	186872	11	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	151507	662	30788	7487	0
4	PU3b-NS-400	0.671	201866	10	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	172723	715	35249	7942	0
3	PU3b-NS-100	0.618	277457	8	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	337660	1111	68145	7952	0
2	PU3b-R1	0.422	603619	5	15	0.505	0	62021	0	8	17	775225	2405	157929	8849	0
1	PU3b-0	0.259	619625	0	0	0.390	0	0	0	8	17	802390	2451	162913	8960	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Attachment 8 – Consumer Reports Analysis of Results – Planning Unit 4

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-1. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.799	204678	17	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	95703	348	15915	4989	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.798	219061	15	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	104660	368	17440	5268	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.783	256551	13	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	167301	477	25749	5528	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.742	235047	17	12	0.575	-95	45684	-2	1	85	150293	402	24061	5827	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.736	268096	16	10	0.575	-88	45684	-2	1	85	210120	504	31771	6218	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.734	221521	19	14	0.575	-99	45684	-2	1	85	142770	381	22681	5475	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.690	464756	13	10	0.575	-88	45684	-2	1	85	366288	994	57177	5203	0
2	PU4-R1	0.686	560602	11	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	427818	1100	68216	6333	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.654	551717	14	12	0.575	-95	45684	-2	1	85	406359	1104	64076	5583	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.645	548809	15	14	0.575	-99	45684	-2	1	85	407371	1098	63848	5480	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.558	259791	24	10	0.575	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	216321	522	32874	4727	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.552	260998	24	10	0.575	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	200336	506	29790	4677	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.541	227588	26	10	0.575	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	133597	377	19525	4052	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.531	244188	25	10	0.575	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	154058	420	24663	4786	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.501	463215	23	10	0.575	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	368065	1008	57832	4511	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.499	457921	23	10	0.575	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	342930	959	51849	4460	0
1	PU4-0	0.468	579550	0	0	0.385	0	0	0	0	33	507023	1171	76283	6494	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.459	466471	23	10	0.575	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	367547	1001	57492	4843	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.434	545618	23	10	0.575	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	403188	1088	63279	5302	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-2. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.791	210228	17	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	101785	366	17357	5335	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.787	229363	15	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	126180	414	21525	5614	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.760	285354	14	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	234272	589	35778	5874	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.724	255562	18	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	192854	486	31515	6200	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.721	238025	19	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	167925	436	27414	5855	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.703	303597	16	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	297375	643	44198	6585	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.662	486513	14	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	443691	1109	67692	5456	0
2	PU4-R1	0.650	610336	11	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	534452	1274	83600	7006	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.630	583400	15	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	479503	1221	74427	5956	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.621	580609	15	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	478480	1215	74102	5861	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.533	282068	25	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	303619	653	44968	4980	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.530	238915	27	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	150646	419	23037	4328	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.529	280998	25	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	279540	625	40456	4920	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.514	258361	25	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	202557	507	33116	5038	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.479	484971	23	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	445469	1123	68347	4763	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.478	477836	23	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	413681	1066	61431	4703	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.436	488227	23	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	444951	1116	68007	5096	0
1	PU4-0	0.436	629804	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	579298	1338	90110	7210	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.409	577410	24	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	478894	1207	73804	5670	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-3. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.807	196818	17	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	91518	338	15074	4422	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.807	209574	15	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	99319	354	16332	4725	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.792	243128	13	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	159076	464	24871	4990	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.749	221214	17	12	1	-95	45684	-2	1	85	152074	409	24876	5236	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.744	251384	16	10	1	-88	45684	-2	1	85	210063	514	33005	5618	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.741	208975	19	14	1	-99	45684	-2	1	85	144695	389	23575	4862	0
2	PU4-R1	0.688	533974	11	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	452545	1155	73986	5784	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.687	450558	13	10	1	-88	45684	-2	1	85	386757	1045	61927	5116	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.647	525855	14	12	1	-95	45684	-2	1	85	421049	1141	67942	6107	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.638	523029	15	14	1	-99	45684	-2	1	85	421062	1133	67546	6018	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.564	241512	24	10	1	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	214214	527	33776	4280	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.559	241594	24	10	1	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	196477	506	30240	4247	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.548	211788	26	10	1	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	132624	381	20021	3575	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.537	228005	25	10	1	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	155442	425	25435	4317	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.494	448803	23	10	1	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	388533	1059	62594	4809	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.491	444631	23	10	1	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	363081	1013	56648	4776	0
1	PU4-0	0.474	548088	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	516700	1210	80344	5902	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.452	452056	23	10	1	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	388024	1052	62257	5135	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.424	520453	23	10	1	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	418916	1126	67302	6086	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-4. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-A (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-A

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.802	201289	17	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	94577	347	15668	4668	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.799	217161	15	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	114833	384	18898	4971	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.773	267220	14	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	216322	563	33538	5237	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.736	237129	18	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	184270	468	29957	5498	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.731	222421	19	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	162942	427	26655	5129	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.715	280789	16	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	282318	630	43078	5876	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.664	468502	14	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	449513	1134	69847	5296	0
2	PU4-R1	0.660	575361	11	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	538361	1293	85920	6263	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.628	552144	15	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	478796	1230	75585	6369	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.620	549424	15	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	477251	1222	75139	6286	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.544	259528	25	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	287677	635	43626	4460	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.540	257835	25	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	261215	602	38550	4418	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.540	221120	27	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	143393	407	21984	3769	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.524	238902	25	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	194704	490	31751	4497	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.476	466747	23	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	451289	1148	70514	4989	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.475	461208	23	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	418667	1092	63563	4947	0
1	PU4-0	0.449	589990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	574660	1343	90943	6412	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.434	470000	23	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	450780	1141	70176	5315	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.405	546820	24	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	478639	1216	75054	6344	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-5. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.874	204678	17	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	95703	348	15915	4989	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.873	219061	15	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	104660	368	17440	5268	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.865	256551	13	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	167301	477	25749	5528	0
2	PU4-R1	0.818	560602	11	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	427818	1100	68216	6333	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.783	235047	17	12	0.575	-95	45684	-2	1	85	150293	402	24061	5827	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.781	268096	16	10	0.575	-88	45684	-2	1	85	210120	504	31771	6218	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.780	221521	19	14	0.575	-99	45684	-2	1	85	142770	381	22681	5475	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.768	464756	13	10	0.575	-88	45684	-2	1	85	366288	994	57177	5203	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.748	551717	14	12	0.575	-95	45684	-2	1	85	406359	1104	64076	5583	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.743	548809	15	14	0.575	-99	45684	-2	1	85	407371	1098	63848	5480	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.564	259791	24	10	0.575	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	216321	522	32874	4727	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.541	463215	23	10	0.575	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	368065	1008	57832	4511	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.539	260998	24	10	0.575	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	200336	506	29790	4677	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.523	227588	26	10	0.575	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	133597	377	19525	4052	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.518	457921	23	10	0.575	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	342930	959	51849	4460	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.515	244188	25	10	0.575	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	154058	420	24663	4786	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.483	466471	23	10	0.575	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	367547	1001	57492	4843	0
1	PU4-0	0.474	579550	0	0	0.385	0	0	0	0	33	507023	1171	76283	6494	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.470	545618	23	10	0.575	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	403188	1088	63279	5302	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-6. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.868	210228	17	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	101785	366	17357	5335	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.865	229363	15	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	126180	414	21525	5614	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.853	285354	14	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	234272	589	35778	5874	0
2	PU4-R1	0.798	610336	11	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	534452	1274	83600	7006	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.773	255562	18	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	192854	486	31515	6200	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.772	238025	19	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	167925	436	27414	5855	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.763	303597	16	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	297375	643	44198	6585	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.753	486513	14	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	443691	1109	67692	5456	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.735	583400	15	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	479503	1221	74427	5956	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.730	580609	15	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	478480	1215	74102	5861	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.551	282068	25	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	303619	653	44968	4980	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.529	484971	23	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	445469	1123	68347	4763	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.527	280998	25	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	279540	625	40456	4920	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.516	238915	27	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	150646	419	23037	4328	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.507	477836	23	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	413681	1066	61431	4703	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.505	258361	25	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	202557	507	33116	5038	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.472	488227	23	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	444951	1116	68007	5096	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.456	577410	24	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	478894	1207	73804	5670	0
1	PU4-0	0.456	629804	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	579298	1338	90110	7210	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-7. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.881	196818	17	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	91518	338	15074	4422	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.880	209574	15	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	99319	354	16332	4725	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.872	243128	13	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	159076	464	24871	4990	0
2	PU4-R1	0.823	533974	11	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	452545	1155	73986	5784	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.790	221214	17	12	1	-95	45684	-2	1	85	152074	409	24876	5236	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.788	251384	16	10	1	-88	45684	-2	1	85	210063	514	33005	5618	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.787	208975	19	14	1	-99	45684	-2	1	85	144695	389	23575	4862	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.767	450558	13	10	1	-88	45684	-2	1	85	386757	1045	61927	5116	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.741	525855	14	12	1	-95	45684	-2	1	85	421049	1141	67942	6107	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.736	523029	15	14	1	-99	45684	-2	1	85	421062	1133	67546	6018	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.569	241512	24	10	1	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	214214	527	33776	4280	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.544	241594	24	10	1	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	196477	506	30240	4247	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.536	448803	23	10	1	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	388533	1059	62594	4809	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.529	211788	26	10	1	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	132624	381	20021	3575	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.520	228005	25	10	1	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	155442	425	25435	4317	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.512	444631	23	10	1	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	363081	1013	56648	4776	0
1	PU4-0	0.480	548088	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	516700	1210	80344	5902	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.478	452056	23	10	1	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	388024	1052	62257	5135	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.460	520453	23	10	1	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	418916	1126	67302	6086	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-8. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-B (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-B

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.877	201289	17	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	94577	347	15668	4668	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.874	217161	15	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	114833	384	18898	4971	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.862	267220	14	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	216322	563	33538	5237	0
2	PU4-R1	0.807	575361	11	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	538361	1293	85920	6263	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.782	237129	18	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	184270	468	29957	5498	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.781	222421	19	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	162942	427	26655	5129	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.773	280789	16	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	282318	630	43078	5876	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.755	468502	14	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	449513	1134	69847	5296	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.731	552144	15	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	478796	1230	75585	6369	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.726	549424	15	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	477251	1222	75139	6286	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.559	259528	25	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	287677	635	43626	4460	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.535	257835	25	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	261215	602	38550	4418	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.526	466747	23	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	451289	1148	70514	4989	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.523	221120	27	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	143393	407	21984	3769	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.512	238902	25	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	194704	490	31751	4497	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.504	461208	23	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	418667	1092	63563	4947	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.469	470000	23	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	450780	1141	70176	5315	0
1	PU4-0	0.466	589990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	574660	1343	90943	6412	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.450	546820	24	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	478639	1216	75054	6344	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-9. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.674	204678	17	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	95703	348	15915	4989	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.672	235047	17	12	0.575	-95	45684	-2	1	85	150293	402	24061	5827	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.671	219061	15	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	104660	368	17440	5268	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.670	221521	19	14	0.575	-99	45684	-2	1	85	142770	381	22681	5475	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.646	268096	16	10	0.575	-88	45684	-2	1	85	210120	504	31771	6218	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.636	256551	13	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	167301	477	25749	5528	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.625	227588	26	10	0.575	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	133597	377	19525	4052	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.604	260998	24	10	0.575	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	200336	506	29790	4677	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.602	244188	25	10	0.575	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	154058	420	24663	4786	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.590	259791	24	10	0.575	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	216321	522	32874	4727	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.531	464756	13	10	0.575	-88	45684	-2	1	85	366288	994	57177	5203	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.474	457921	23	10	0.575	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	342930	959	51849	4460	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.456	551717	14	12	0.575	-95	45684	-2	1	85	406359	1104	64076	5583	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.451	463215	23	10	0.575	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	368065	1008	57832	4511	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.451	548809	15	14	0.575	-99	45684	-2	1	85	407371	1098	63848	5480	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.433	466471	23	10	0.575	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	367547	1001	57492	4843	0
2	PU4-R1	0.404	560602	11	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	427818	1100	68216	6333	0
1	PU4-0	0.397	579550	0	0	0.385	0	0	0	0	33	507023	1171	76283	6494	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.373	545618	23	10	0.575	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	403188	1088	63279	5302	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-10. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.660	210228	17	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	101785	366	17357	5335	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.648	229363	15	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	126180	414	21525	5614	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.643	238025	19	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	167925	436	27414	5855	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.637	255562	18	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	192854	486	31515	6200	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.603	238915	27	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	150646	419	23037	4328	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.592	285354	14	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	234272	589	35778	5874	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.586	303597	16	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	297375	643	44198	6585	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.570	258361	25	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	202557	507	33116	5038	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.562	280998	25	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	279540	625	40456	4920	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.544	282068	25	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	303619	653	44968	4980	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.483	486513	14	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	443691	1109	67692	5456	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.434	477836	23	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	413681	1066	61431	4703	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.409	583400	15	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	479503	1221	74427	5956	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.409	484971	23	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	445469	1123	68347	4763	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.403	580609	15	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	478480	1215	74102	5861	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.390	488227	23	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	444951	1116	68007	5096	0
2	PU4-R1	0.331	610336	11	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	534452	1274	83600	7006	0
1	PU4-0	0.331	629804	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	579298	1338	90110	7210	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.323	577410	24	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	478894	1207	73804	5670	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-11. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.692	196818	17	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	91518	338	15074	4422	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.689	221214	17	12	1	-95	45684	-2	1	85	152074	409	24876	5236	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.689	209574	15	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	99319	354	16332	4725	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.688	208975	19	14	1	-99	45684	-2	1	85	144695	389	23575	4862	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.665	251384	16	10	1	-88	45684	-2	1	85	210063	514	33005	5618	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.656	243128	13	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	159076	464	24871	4990	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.642	211788	26	10	1	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	132624	381	20021	3575	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.622	241594	24	10	1	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	196477	506	30240	4247	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.618	228005	25	10	1	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	155442	425	25435	4317	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.606	241512	24	10	1	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	214214	527	33776	4280	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.529	450558	13	10	1	-88	45684	-2	1	85	386757	1045	61927	5116	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.463	444631	23	10	1	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	363081	1013	56648	4776	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.449	525855	14	12	1	-95	45684	-2	1	85	421049	1141	67942	6107	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.443	523029	15	14	1	-99	45684	-2	1	85	421062	1133	67546	6018	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.441	448803	23	10	1	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	388533	1059	62594	4809	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.423	452056	23	10	1	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	388024	1052	62257	5135	0
1	PU4-0	0.417	548088	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	516700	1210	80344	5902	0
2	PU4-R1	0.417	533974	11	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	452545	1155	73986	5784	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.359	520453	23	10	1	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	418916	1126	67302	6086	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-12. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-C (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-C

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.682	201289	17	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	94577	347	15668	4668	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.673	217161	15	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	114833	384	18898	4971	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.668	222421	19	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	162942	427	26655	5129	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.663	237129	18	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	184270	468	29957	5498	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.626	221120	27	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	143393	407	21984	3769	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.619	267220	14	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	216322	563	33538	5237	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.615	280789	16	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	282318	630	43078	5876	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.593	238902	25	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	194704	490	31751	4497	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.588	257835	25	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	261215	602	38550	4418	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.568	259528	25	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	287677	635	43626	4460	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.490	468502	14	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	449513	1134	69847	5296	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.432	461208	23	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	418667	1092	63563	4947	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.412	552144	15	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	478796	1230	75585	6369	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.407	466747	23	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	451289	1148	70514	4989	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.406	549424	15	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	477251	1222	75139	6286	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.389	470000	23	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	450780	1141	70176	5315	0
1	PU4-0	0.365	589990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	574660	1343	90943	6412	0
2	PU4-R1	0.359	575361	11	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	538361	1293	85920	6263	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.320	546820	24	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	478639	1216	75054	6344	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-13. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 1, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 1: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.731	204678	17	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	95703	348	15915	4989	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.719	219061	15	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	104660	368	17440	5268	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.690	221521	19	14	0.575	-99	45684	-2	1	85	142770	381	22681	5475	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.685	256551	13	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	167301	477	25749	5528	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.682	235047	17	12	0.575	-95	45684	-2	1	85	150293	402	24061	5827	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.653	268096	16	10	0.575	-88	45684	-2	1	85	210120	504	31771	6218	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.629	260998	24	10	0.575	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	200336	506	29790	4677	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.628	227588	26	10	0.575	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	133597	377	19525	4052	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.595	244188	25	10	0.575	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	154058	420	24663	4786	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.580	464756	13	10	0.575	-88	45684	-2	1	85	366288	994	57177	5203	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.578	259791	24	10	0.575	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	216321	522	32874	4727	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.536	457921	23	10	0.575	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	342930	959	51849	4460	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.524	551717	14	12	0.575	-95	45684	-2	1	85	406359	1104	64076	5583	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.521	548809	15	14	0.575	-99	45684	-2	1	85	407371	1098	63848	5480	0
2	PU4-R1	0.498	560602	11	15	0.575	0	45684	0	0	33	427818	1100	68216	6333	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.478	463215	23	10	0.575	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	368065	1008	57832	4511	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.464	466471	23	10	0.575	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	367547	1001	57492	4843	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.417	545618	23	10	0.575	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	403188	1088	63279	5302	0
1	PU4-0	0.331	579550	0	0	0.385	0	0	0	0	33	507023	1171	76283	6494	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-14. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 2, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 2: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.715	210228	17	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	101785	366	17357	5335	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.697	229363	15	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	126180	414	21525	5614	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.663	238025	19	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	167925	436	27414	5855	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.649	255562	18	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	192854	486	31515	6200	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.645	285354	14	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	234272	589	35778	5874	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.608	238915	27	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	150646	419	23037	4328	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.592	280998	25	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	279540	625	40456	4920	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.585	303597	16	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	297375	643	44198	6585	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.565	258361	25	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	202557	507	33116	5038	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.537	282068	25	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	303619	653	44968	4980	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.524	486513	14	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	443691	1109	67692	5456	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.501	477836	23	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	413681	1066	61431	4703	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.481	583400	15	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	479503	1221	74427	5956	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.478	580609	15	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	478480	1215	74102	5861	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.441	484971	23	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	445469	1123	68347	4763	0
2	PU4-R1	0.431	610336	11	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	534452	1274	83600	7006	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.427	488227	23	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	444951	1116	68007	5096	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.373	577410	24	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	478894	1207	73804	5670	0
1	PU4-0	0.268	629804	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	579298	1338	90110	7210	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-15. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 3, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 3: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.754	196818	17	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	91518	338	15074	4422	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.742	209574	15	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	99319	354	16332	4725	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.711	208975	19	14	1	-99	45684	-2	1	85	144695	389	23575	4862	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.708	243128	13	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	159076	464	24871	4990	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.703	221214	17	12	1	-95	45684	-2	1	85	152074	409	24876	5236	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.674	251384	16	10	1	-88	45684	-2	1	85	210063	514	33005	5618	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.648	241594	24	10	1	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	196477	506	30240	4247	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.647	211788	26	10	1	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	132624	381	20021	3575	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.613	228005	25	10	1	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	155442	425	25435	4317	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.596	241512	24	10	1	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	214214	527	33776	4280	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.578	450558	13	10	1	-88	45684	-2	1	85	386757	1045	61927	5116	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.520	444631	23	10	1	-2221	45684	-4	3	116	363081	1013	56648	4776	0
2	PU4-R1	0.512	533974	11	15	1	0	45684	0	0	33	452545	1155	73986	5784	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.506	525855	14	12	1	-95	45684	-2	1	85	421049	1141	67942	6107	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.503	523029	15	14	1	-99	45684	-2	1	85	421062	1133	67546	6018	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.463	448803	23	10	1	-1763	45684	-4	0	115	388533	1059	62594	4809	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.449	452056	23	10	1	-2483	45684	-4	1	115	388024	1052	62257	5135	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.390	520453	23	10	1	-2485	45684	-4	1	115	418916	1126	67302	6086	0
1	PU4-0	0.351	548088	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	516700	1210	80344	5902	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
 DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix

Table A8-16. “Consumer Reports Analysis” for PU-4, Scenario 4, Cluster GA-D (Baton Rouge, only)

Scenario 4: Cluster GA-D

Plan	Plan Code	MAU	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
5	PU4-NS-1000	0.742	201289	17	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	94577	347	15668	4668	0
4	PU4-NS-400	0.726	217161	15	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	114833	384	18898	4971	0
12	PU4-C-RL-1000-1	0.692	222421	19	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	162942	427	26655	5129	0
11	PU4-C-RL-400-1	0.679	237129	18	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	184270	468	29957	5498	0
3	PU4-NS-100	0.675	267220	14	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	216322	563	33538	5237	0
9	PU4-C-G-1000-3	0.633	221120	27	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	143393	407	21984	3769	0
6	PU4-C-G-100-1	0.618	257835	25	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	261215	602	38550	4418	0
10	PU4-C-RL-100-1	0.617	280789	16	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	282318	630	43078	5876	0
8	PU4-C-G-400-3	0.590	238902	25	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	194704	490	31751	4497	0
7	PU4-C-G-100-2	0.563	259528	25	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	287677	635	43626	4460	0
17	PU4-RL-100-1	0.529	468502	14	10	1	-88	45618	-2	0	85	449513	1134	69847	5296	0
13	PU4-G-100-1	0.493	461208	23	10	1	-2221	45618	-4	3	116	418667	1092	63563	4947	0
18	PU4-RL-400-1	0.473	552144	15	12	1	-95	45618	-2	1	85	478796	1230	75585	6369	0
19	PU4-RL-1000-1	0.470	549424	15	14	1	-99	45618	-2	1	85	477251	1222	75139	6286	0
2	PU4-R1	0.459	575361	11	15	1	0	45618	0	0	33	538361	1293	85920	6263	0
14	PU4-G-100-2	0.434	466747	23	10	1	-1763	45618	-4	0	115	451289	1148	70514	4989	0
15	PU4-G-400-3	0.420	470000	23	10	1	-2483	45618	-4	1	115	450780	1141	70176	5315	0
16	PU4-G-1000-3	0.357	546820	24	10	1	-2485	45618	-4	1	115	478639	1216	75054	6344	0
1	PU4-0	0.303	589990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	574660	1343	90943	6412	0

DRAFT - Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration (LACPR) Technical Report
DRAFT – Risk-Informed Decision Framework Appendix